

tentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain.

Jacob D. Beam, of New Jersey, a Foreign Services Officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

John S. D. Eisenhower, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

James F. Battin, of Montana, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Montana vice William J. Jameson.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Hilary J. Sandoval, Jr., of Texas, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Lawrence M. Cox, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

Francis C. Turner, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Secor D. Browne, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Donald L. Jackson, of California, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1973, vice Grant E. Syphers, deceased.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Eugene T. Rossides, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

UNITED NATIONS

Lt. Gen. Harry Jacob Lemley, Jr., O19756, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), for appointment as senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grades as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Ferdinand Joseph Chesarek, O21177, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be Lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. William Eugene DePuy, O34710, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

IN THE NAVY

Having designated Rear Adm. Edwin B. Hooper, U.S. Navy for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SUPPORT FOR ENDING POSTAL PATRONAGE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Fond du Lac (Wis.) Commonwealth Reporter, Feb. 6, 1969]

AT LEAST A START

There are so many things wrong with the United States postal service that even a small semblance of effort to improve it and meet some of its problems is more than welcome by the general patronizing public.

President Nixon, at his press conference Wednesday, announced that effective immediately, all postmasterships will be removed from the political patronage system. The President said it was a historic decision to eliminate political considerations which he claimed have been traditionally considered in the election of postmasters since the earliest days of the Republic.

Postmaster Gen. Winton M. Blount participated in the Nixon press conference at which it was claimed that, when future vacancies occur for postmasterships or rural carrier jobs, "The best qualified candidates will be appointed, regardless of politics—indeed without anyone even asking the candidates' political affiliation."

It is strange that rural carriers should be included in the political patronage business, but the records of county party committees, including Fond du Lac, are filled with copies of letters suggesting donations on behalf of the higher-ranking candidates for everything from postmasterships and rural mail carriers to the lesser of all positions—the janitor at the post office.

We suppose there is nothing to prevent senators and representatives and county party chairmen from writing a letter of recommendation for a candidate under the new "policy."

In all job vacancies involved the three top scorers only will be considered after open, competitive civil service examinations, as is supposed to be the case with all career federal positions, the postmaster general said.

Both Nixon and the Postmaster General insisted that politics would play no role in the choice among the three highest candidates for postal positions. They also said that no member of Congress—or politician—would be called upon to recommend which of the top-scoring candidates should be selected. The White House, it is claimed, will submit nominations on the basis of its own non-political decisions.

Announcements by the President and the Postmaster General must be taken at their face value.

We still are convinced that Rep. William A. Steiger of the 6th District should continue to press for enactment of his proposed legislation to do away with the present requirement that the Senate confirm nominations for postmasterships.

[WHBL editorial, Feb. 10, 1969]

ENDING POSTAL PATRONAGE

President Richard Nixon announced last Wednesday immediate removal of all postmaster and rural mail carrier appointments from political patronage. Such appointments previously have been made through a system involving political favoritism.

For several years, WHBL has editorialized in favor of Nixon's recent action. Several congressmen and senators from Wisconsin, including Rep. William A. Steiger of the Sixth District, have introduced legislation which would have accomplished the same goal.

The President, making the announcement jointly with the Postmaster General, Winton Blount, said that under "an historic new postal policy" such appointments would be made under open examinations with the top qualifiers getting the jobs.

It takes a certain amount of courage for the political party in power to divest itself of the spoils of office, and all thinking Americans should recognize the integrity which the Nixon Administration has exhibited by so doing.

But there is more than political power involved. The U.S. Postal system is in deep trouble. Inefficiencies have crept into the organization over the years. Bureaucratic troubles have increased as the demand for more postal services has grown. Postal rates have skyrocketed in recent years with no end in sight.

By selecting the most competent men to serve as postmasters, at least some of these problems can be tackled. It is a step in the right direction.

But bolder action is called for. A presidential commission headed by the former president of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company recommended that a semi-private organization operate the postal system, similar to the corporation which operates the communication satellites.

We believe that Mr. Blount and the Nixon administration seriously consider the commission's recommendations in the months ahead.

New efficiencies are needed. Better postal service is needed. Lower postal rates are incumbent. Only through better organization, utilizing the principles of sound business practices can we hope to save the post office from its almost certain disastrous fate.

If it is true that "mail moves the country," then for the sake of the country, we had better solve the postal problem without delay.

[WTMJ-TV editorial, Feb. 6, 1969]

It used to be in the changeover of occupants at the White House that "to the victors belong the spoils." President Nixon is modifying this to the extent that it involves postoffice patronage. Up until now the jobs of postmasters and rural carriers have been handed out with political considerations uppermost in mind. The system, in recent years, has been the target of attack by both Republicans and Democrats. The elimination of the spoils system in the postoffice has had strong bipartisan support among Wisconsin congressmen.

Actually, the appointments throughout the years have caused many a headache. Here in Wisconsin last June five officers of the Marinette county Democratic executive committee resigned because they thought the wrong Democrat got the job of postmaster at Marinette. Only recently former Lieut.-Governor Pat Lucey told Dodge County Democrats that they should be "thankful for one small blessing that comes to us out of President Nixon's inaugural. We (meaning the Democrats) are freed of all responsibility for postoffice patronage."

Well, the Republicans are now, too, because of Nixon's action. The President has ordered the civil service commission to conduct open competitive examinations for job vacancies and to fill them solely on merit. Furthermore, Postmaster-General Blount is recommending new legislation to remove the requirement that the senate confirm postmaster appointments. President Nixon and Postmaster Blount are instituting business-

like practices to a government department that is in dire need of being run like a business, instead of being a haven for political lackeys.

NIGERIA AND BIAFRA

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just concluded my second journey within 6 weeks to Nigeria and Biafra.

Until now, I have refrained from public discussions of these trips and of my impressions of the situation there, in the hope that I might thus be able to be more helpful in the effort to increase the flow of food and drugs into the afflicted areas. The effort to increase the flow of relief must remain a primary concern of men of good will, and since that problem—the problem of finding new ways of getting relief in—is still at a critical point, I will limit comments today to these general observations:

First. The charge that the Federal Military Government of Nigeria is engaged in a campaign of willful genocide cannot be sustained. The fear of genocide among many Biafrans, however, is very deep, and is reinforced by continued bombings which inflict heavy civilian casualties on what can only be described as a random basis not visibly connected to military considerations. The effect of these bombings, in addition to feeding fears of genocide in Biafra, has been to stiffen the general will to resist. This is not, perhaps, a surprising reaction in view of similar experiences elsewhere.

Second. Suffering in Biafra and in the war-torn areas of Nigeria is acute. On the Nigerian side of the front lines, relief operations have been relatively effective in easing the problem of starvation. The authorities in Lagos have generously cooperated with relief workers who have sought to make food and medical supplies available to those in need regardless of tribal origin or political viewpoint. On the Biafran side, the acute protein famine of last summer, which caused somewhat more than a half million deaths, has been eased, but the overall food situation continues to deteriorate. Carbohydrate deficiencies will reach catastrophic proportions in the near future as the last of the seed yams and casavas are consumed, and there is in fact no prospect that internal food production in Biafra will be able to meet more than a third of the need of the population now residing in Biafra. That population can reasonably be estimated at over 7 million people.

Third. Whatever the ultimate political or military resolution of the conflict, to await such a resolution as the best way to cope with the relief problem is to invite into existence an enormous graveyard which must haunt the conscience of the world and dominate the future of the area.

The battle lines have in fact, been largely stabilized for several months,

and there is now no prospect of a military decision without great new military exertions. The outcome of these exertions, should they now be forthcoming, will clearly be a major determinant of how the differences between Nigeria and Biafra are ultimately resolved, but unless massive quantities of relief get into the afflicted area in the meantime, this ultimate solution may well be the final one for a great many people, who may by then be dead from starvation. So I think it would be most irresponsible to suggest that there is no need to press for emergency relief efforts pending military developments.

Fourth. On the other hand, the unhappy legacies and memories of colonialism make interventions by Western or white governments or groups, however nobly intentioned, precarious, at best, and potentially quite harmful if these interventions should appear to be in pursuit of particular political or military results.

Ultimately, the matters at issue will have to be worked out by the people of the area involved.

Fifth. Nigeria and Biafra are now much too far apart to hope that acceptable conditions can be found for an early truce or cease-fire, let alone for negotiations that might avert further efforts to achieve a military resolution to the conflict.

We may all continue to hope for developments that will make steps toward peace possible at the earliest possible date. But the fact is that the best hope at this time for decreasing suffering and avoiding greater tragedies lies in the effort to find ways to bring in relief which are not dependent on truce, cease-fire, or successful negotiations for an end to the conflict.

Sixth. In this connection, the outpouring of compassion and concern among people around the world is gratifying and helpful. It would be an appalling indictment of the human race were there not such concern. The great response of children and students to the suffering of faraway contemporaries is especially heartwarming.

In fact, this outpouring of compassion and concern can provide the most hopeful antidote to expanding tragedy, if it leads to intelligent, informed, concerted action by men of good will here and elsewhere. But this action should now be concentrated on the proper—and urgent—effort to implement programs that will ease the suffering of the civilian victims of the war, not futile efforts to impose political solutions on Nigerians or Biafrans.

The notion that it is somehow racist for white people to be concerned about starvation in Biafra puts the situation precisely backward; it would be the absence of such concern that in fact would be racist. To say that because the people starving are black it is no one's business except other people who are black, would be a most pernicious kind of racism.

Seventh. From their public statements—and private assurances—the Governments of Nigeria and Biafra must be assumed to be dedicated to find-

ing ways to permit and expedite massive infusions of relief in the immediate future. I can see no value in doubting the good faith of either side on this critical question at this critical moment.

The world will be waiting to see which side, if either fails, by delay, pretext, or evasion to live up to these assurances. We can meanwhile express our gratitude to the Government of the Republic of Dahomey for allowing relief flights to operate from its territory. If the Dahomey Government had not responded with such compassion and wisdom, the slack caused by the sad decision of the Government of Equatorial Guinea to cancel rather precipitately such flights from its territory would have had tragic consequences for countless additional people.

Eighth. The attitude of the new administration on these questions has been most encouraging. The Government of the United States can do much to ease suffering. Our resources and skills should be more deeply committed. Our good offices should be available.

The magnificent efforts of Caritas, Nordchurch Aid, and the International Committee of the Red Cross have shown that private citizens and voluntary organizations are capable of heroic efforts to meet great needs.

But the need is clearly too great to be met by private citizens and voluntary organizations alone. The policies and energies of the great international organizations—the U.N., the Commonwealth, the OAU, OCAM—as well as those of the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and other concerned countries, should now be coordinated to bring about the immediate acceptance and implementation of a massive emergency relief program.

We are at the point where the next fortnight will tell whether the appalling specter of enormous additional numbers of people needlessly dead from and crippled by hunger and disease is to hang over the rest of this century.

The intricacies of finding a way to get food in to the afflicted areas can be resolved if the forces of good will in and out of Nigeria and Biafra join in the determination to resolve them. I cannot believe that this will not be done in view of what is at stake.

THE 51ST ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my voice to those of my colleagues who this week have spoken in honor of the 51st anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Lithuania is a proud nation, and the Lithuanians are a proud people. Every day that the Lithuanian people are denied the freedom and independence they once enjoyed is a cause for shame.

It was in February 1261, more than seven centuries ago, that Lithuania was established as an independent state. It was on February 16, 1918, after centuries of independence, that the Lithuanians broke the bonds of Russian domination and German occupation and declared their nation free and independent.

But in June 1940, in direct violation of a treaty with Lithuania, the Soviet Union occupied the Baltic States. Ever since then the Lithuanians have been forced to live under the Soviet yoke.

Mr. Speaker, Americans of Lithuanian extraction are among our most patriotic and industrious citizens. Let us join with them in the hope that Lithuanians again will see their mother country free—and independent, as she deserves to be.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the prize-winning speech delivered by William Jockheck in the South Dakota Voice of Democracy Contest.

It is refreshing and encouraging to know that there are young people like Bill who cherish our American freedom and accept the responsibilities that accompany it. It is a welcome contrast to the radical demonstrators on college campuses who demand complete freedom, without regard for the interests of others and without any regulations.

I urge my colleagues to read Bill Jockheck's speech which follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

We have just come from a field of battle. In that battle we have selected a president. But in this regular phenomenon there is something singularly unusual. That is the field on which the battle is fought, a background of freedom with a structure of democracy.

This field is of great value but members of my generation are losing sight of just how valuable and how dangerous such a field can be. The last two generations know all too well the cost of freedom, and in their struggles to preserve it they saw it as a glowing gift, an end in itself, to hand to their children.

But he knows not freedom whose freedom has not been threatened. Freedom means nothing lest those having it be threatened with its loss. It is only in this way one can know the meaning of freedom. Just as one does not know the meaning of hunger until he has been starving; one does not know the meaning of freedom until he has been without it.

Thus today, the threat to freedom is not from without so much as from within. Since my generation has known nothing but freedom, we take it for granted. What is worse, many keep grabbing for more and more of their so-called freedoms. They want freedom from morals, freedom from work, freedom from laws.

These individuals can be seen in demonstrations from coast to coast. Somehow, they believe they deserve complete freedom.

They are not concerned about how their freedoms affect others. Many times the limits of freedom are described thus: your freedom to swing your arm stops just short of the end of my nose. This means nothing to growing numbers of young people. They think it is their right to be able to destroy public and private property, hold public officials and demand exemption from the laws. Their freedoms are one-sided. If the freedoms they expect were granted for all, there would be anarchy. But anarchy results in elimination of rights and protections. Freedom can only exist within the bounds of regulations. Freedom must be restricted or there can be no freedom for the majority.

These facts are ignored by those idealistic and impractical youths who have known nothing but freedom. This generation raised in permissiveness can not see beyond their own desires. To them, freedom is theirs. They fail to see the situation from a practical standpoint. What would happen if these so-called freedoms were given to all?

These individuals have failed to see what freedom is. Freedom is not a golden god to be worshiped. It is a tool. A tool with which we can improve ourselves, our society and our world. But like all tools it can also be used as an instrument of destruction as well as construction.

Freedom can be easily compared to atomic energy in this sense. The atom used for peace has practically no limits on what it can do. It can power our cities, light and heat our homes, create mutants for greater productivity and on and on the list goes. But as a tool of destruction it is also unparalleled in its potential.

So it is with freedom. Properly used in moderation, with respect for the rights of others and not just our rights, freedom and democracy can lead to peaks of prosperity and peace, but if freedom is only taken, without respect to responsibility, it can be just as destructive as any bomb. Those who want freedom without responsibility have failed. They will turn freedom into a destructive force. But to take freedom and willingly accept its responsibilities, to use it in appropriate moderation, with respect for others, this is freedom's challenge.

PUTTING CURBS ON MAILINGS OF PORNOGRAPHIC MATTER TO MINORS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has been working diligently in its effort to deal with the continuing problem of obscene material that is being sent through the mails, particularly to our young people.

The Congress has enacted legislation to deal with this difficult matter, but it is clear that further action is necessary.

I am introducing a proposal today which I am convinced will provide tighter control over the mailing of objectionable material to minors.

My bill will impose a stricter ban on the use of the mails, in any way, for the solicitation, sale, delivery or distribution of pornographic material to a minor.

The same ban would apply on mailings to any person with whom a minor resides.

This new authority to the Post Office Department, with enforcement provision,

is aimed directly at the area of greatest concern: The continuing unsolicited mailings to our young people.

In trying to curb the flow of smut, I feel it is essential that the law spells out in detail exactly what type of material is objectionable and should be banned from the mails. Such standards are a vital feature of my bill.

The Federal antipandering law, which originated in our committee, has been in operation nearly a year, and has proven its worth in giving recipients of such mail a way in which to halt further solicitations.

Since last April, the Department has received nearly 170,000 complaints about material which the recipients considered to be of the smut variety.

Acting on these complaints, the Department was able to order the removal of names from the mailing lists, under threat of referral of individual cases to the Justice Department.

What we aim to do in the legislation I am introducing today is to stop unsolicited mailings to minors at their source. Certainly, my proposal should provide a strong deterrent to random mailings to homes.

NOW IT'S ROTC THEY'RE AFTER

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, college campuses across our great country are today being disrupted by students who think they are better qualified to run the schools than experienced administrators are. These militants represent only a small minority of the total number of students in our colleges. The great majority of our college students are sincere, hard-working young people who are trying to prepare themselves for the future. But in many places, these students have had their education disrupted and delayed for months by those who are more intent on promoting discord and violence.

One of the many issues which these militants use as an excuse for their anarchy is the Reserve Officers Training Corps. Students and faculty members alike have raised opposition to military training at our colleges, and in many instances, have succeeded in having ROTC eliminated from the curriculum.

As one who received a commission through ROTC, I am a strong supporter of this program. It distresses me to see it being devalued as a means of supplying our military services with trained and educated officers. I intend to continue to support our ROTC program, and I sincerely hope that other Members of Congress will publicly express their support.

The Talladega Daily Home is also concerned about this matter, and I would like to insert in the RECORD a copy of an editorial which appeared in that paper recently:

NOW IT'S ROTC THEY'RE AFTER

The rabblers are now taking off after the Reserve Officers Training Corps.

Not satisfied with all they have been protesting and demonstrating about on the campuses, some of the screwball students and faculty members are now challenging the ROTC, the organization that has done so well through the years in providing officer material to the Army, Navy and Air Force.

This year, for example, there are more than 270,000 men enrolled in the corps program. More than 330 colleges are participating. Under this program the Army will be supplied with 50 per cent of its officers, 35 per cent of the Navy's and 30 per cent of the Air Force's.

Students who sign up for ROTC and who finish the program are commissioned. In the Army they serve two years. In the Navy three and in the Air Force four years. By taking military training while in college the boys succeed in getting a better education and the military has a steady source of officer material. Those who sign for the Air Force pay a penalty in that they must serve four years, whereas if they had volunteered the term would have been much shorter, but also as a private. Proportionately, the same is true of the other services.

Military officials are pooch-pooching the protestors. They are "beatniks", the military folks say. However, college officials and students should be on the alert to spot organized opposition to the ROTC for it borders on the opposition to the Vietnam war demonstrations, and there seems to be a tinge of Communist leanings. Let's watch it.

RED SKELTON EXPLAINS OUR PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, how often it is that we let the significance of familiar words escape us temporarily.

On one of his recent television programs, Red Skelton, one of the world's great clowns, gave a pointed example which he recalled from his childhood.

This wonderful story, told with all the emphasis and sincerity which Mr. Skelton can muster whether he be comical or serious, gives real meaning to the words we all know so well, that comprise our Pledge of Allegiance.

Even in printed form, the Skelton story has impact and is worthy of repetition—including his pointed closing comment.

The text of Red Skelton's explanation on his January 14 program was reprinted in the February 15 TV Topics supplement of the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News, as follows:

HOW SKELTON EXPLAINED PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Getting back to schools, I remember a teacher I had. I only went through the 7th grade in school. I left home at 10 years old because I was hungry. I'd work in the summer and go to school in the winter.

I remember this one teacher. To me, he was the greatest teacher, a real sage of my time. He had such wisdom. We were all reciting the Pledge of Allegiance, and he walked over. Mr. Lasswell was his name . . . Mr. Lasswell. He said:

"I've been listening to you boys and girls recite the Pledge of Allegiance all semester, and it seems as though it is becoming monotonous to you. If I say, may I recite it and try to explain to you the meaning of each word."

"I—me an individual, a committee of one. "Pledge—dedicate all of my worldly goods to give without self-pity.

"Allegiance—my love and my devotion. "To the flag—our standard, Old Glory, a symbol of freedom; wherever she waves, there is respect because your loyalty has given her a dignity that shouts freedom is everybody's job.

"Of the United—that means that we have all come together.

"States—individual communities that have united into 48 great states; 48 individual communities with pride and dignity and purpose, all divided with imaginary boundaries, yet united to common purpose, and that's love for country.

"And to the republic—republic, a state in which sovereign power is invested in representatives chosen by the people to govern; and government is the people and it's from the people to the leaders, not from the leaders to the people.

"For which it stands.

"One nation—the nation, meaning, so blessed by God.

"Indivisible—incapable of being divided.

"With liberty—which is freedom and the right of power to live one's own life without threats, or fear or some sort of retaliation.

"And justice—the principle or quality of dealing fairly with others.

"For all—which means, boys, and girls, it's as much your country as it is mine.

"And now, boys and girls, let me hear you recite the Pledge of Allegiance:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Since I was a small boy, two states have been added to our country and two words have been added to the Pledge of Allegiance: "Under God." Wouldn't it be a pity if someone said, "That's a prayer" and that would be eliminated from schools, too?

L. CPL. BOBBY D. ROGERS KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, L. Cpl. Bobby Dale Rogers, an outstanding young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

L. CPL. BOBBY D. ROGERS KILLED BY VIET LAND MINE

Marine Lance Cpl. Bobby Dale Rogers, a former honor student at Glen Burnie High School, has been killed in combat in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Corporal Rogers, 20, lived on Magothy road in Pasadena, Md.

He served as a squad leader in Company K, 3d Division, 26th Marines. Drafted in April, 1968, he had been sent to Vietnam last October.

According to the Defense Department announcement, Corporal Rogers and three other marines were killed when one of them stepped on a land mine while on patrol near Quang Nam last Friday.

After graduating with honors from high school in 1966, Corporal Rogers worked for the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company as an apprentice cable splicer.

He is survived by his mother, Mrs. Thelma R. Rogers, and a brother, Danny R. Rogers, both of Pasadena.

THE PLOT AGAINST DEFENSE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, when a small militant group of malcontents can become so brazen as to plot against our Government defending its own people from destruction, one wonders if treason and genocide are any less actionable because the culprits are scholars, ministers, or officials?

Whose purpose do they serve?

I include a column by Alice Widener from Human Events for February 22, 1969, as follows:

MARCH 4 STRIKE PROPOSED: THE PLOTTING AGAINST OUR MILITARY DEFENSES

(By Alice Widener)

Acting together in a plot, a leftist group of graduate students and professors, at Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge and elsewhere, is trying to organize a nationwide strike of scientists and engineers, March 4, 1969, against our military forces and the industrial corporations that construct our military defenses. The aim of the plot is to set our scientists and engineers against the military and the policies of the U.S. government.

The octopus-like tentacles of the plotters reach from the Office of the MIT Provost, Dr. Jerome Wiesner, former science adviser to President Kennedy and longtime advocate of U.S. unilateral disarmament, to universities throughout our nation, to the Fund for the Republic's leftist Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, Calif., to the marble halls of the United States Senate and Supreme Court.

On Jan. 10, 1969, the following letter was sent to top scientists, researchers, professors and corporation engineers throughout our nation:

"SCIENCE ACTION COORDINATING COMMITTEE, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, Cambridge, Mass., January 10, 1969.

"DEAR FRIEND: As a scientist and an active worker for peace you will be pleased to know that a group of faculty members and students at MIT are organizing against the current trend towards increasing military involvement in scientific research. For this purpose, the Science Action Co-ordinating Committee has been formed and has received wide-spread support in the scientific community at MIT and elsewhere.

"We have set aside a day, March 4th, to begin a vigorous involvement with these issues and during that day we propose that scientists and engineers at MIT and elsewhere, pause in their normal research activities and join us for a day of critical discussion and self-evaluation. The idea has received wide-spread and enthusiastic support from the scientific community at MIT and all over the country.

"We are enclosing a call describing our motives . . . as well as a statement prepared by the Industry Liaison Committee.

"Strong support by scientists and engineers working for industry is desirable because of the part played by industry in promoting the military uses of science. . . ."

Four days before sending out the foregoing letter, the Science Action Co-ordinating Committee (SACC) issued a "progress report" (Jan. 6, 1969) that stated the group was formed "with the primary purpose of organizing a one-day research strike on March 4, 1969. The official sponsoring organization for this project is now the Union of Concerned Scientists. . . ." Coordinator of the

SACC Committee at MIT is Joel Feigenbaum; Elliot Belasco is in charge of inter-university action.

On March 4 members of the nationwide strike group will hold regional meetings to be addressed, according to present schedules, by Nobel Prize winners Hans Bethe of Cornell and George Wald of Harvard; by Gar Alperovitz, a Socialist Scholar, by Sen. George McGovern (D-S.D.) and others.

The main objective of the MIT and affiliated groups (who are closely in touch with the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions through Jerome Wiesner, Sen. McGovern, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas and others) is creation of "a politically active scientific community working outside of government and mobilizing popular support" to set scientists, engineers and researchers against the allegedly "destructive" defense policies of our government. The plotters' chief propaganda aim, at present, is to stop our country from building an anti-ballistic missile system. The Soviet Union already has one. It creates a military security gap in favor of the Communists. The over-all aim of the plotters is unilateral disarmament of the United States.

At the center of the anti-ABM campaign is the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. On Nov. 1, 1968, it sent a letter to presidents of major industrial corporations engaged in defense work announcing "a public discussion," November 19-20, in New York City on "ABM: Yes or No?"

Chairman of the November 19 meeting at the Hilton Hotel was Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, who abandoned a dispassionate role to make a one-sided opening statement. "My lay judgment," said Justice Douglas, "is that the manufacture of these systems of missile defense will make the military-industrial complex rich, will result in the production of huge piles of junk, and will be meaningless in terms of survival."

On November 20 the Center held a closed meeting at the St. Regis Hotel from which the press was barred. The secret talks were attended by four members of the Center staff, including W. H. Ferry and Harvey Wheeler, who are notoriously anti-U.S. government and anti-U.S. military in foreign policy and defense matters.

Among others present were Dr. Jerome Wiesner; Sen. George McGovern; Gen. Leon Johnson, who is in favor of ABM; longtime Socialist Adolph Berle; Prof. I. I. Rabi of Columbia University, participant in Pugwash conferences sponsored by Cyrus Eaton, Lenin Peace Prize winner; and Prof. Franz Shurmann of the University of California at Berkeley, a Socialist Scholar.

The edited version of their secret discussion is being published this month by the Center in a paper entitled "ABM: Yes or No?" Of course, the "noes" have it; the Center wears a figleaf of objectivity to maintain its tax-exempt status, but it has issued over the years a stream of anti-U.S. military, prounilateral U.S. disarmament literature.

The Center's plan to try to stop construction of an American ABM system was formulated as soon as the Johnson Administration proposed building a "thin system," after it became known the Soviets already had a thick one. When President Nixon announced his intention to strengthen U.S. military defenses, the Center intensified its anti-ABM propaganda, using Dr. Wiesner, former science adviser to President Kennedy, as a prime spokesman. Behind the scenes, Wiesner is supporting the leftist-radical Science Action Coordinating Committee's "strike" of scientists and engineers, March 4, 1969, against our government and industrial defense establishments. According to the Boston *Globe*, Dr. Wiesner will kick off the strike on the evening of March 3, along with leftist Prof. Noam Chomsky.

Signers of the March 4 strike call at MIT include the heads of the departments of chemistry, biology, and physics; professors

of aeronautical engineering, of mathematics, economics, and electrical engineering. The MIT Science Action Coordinating Group is in touch with Prof. Melvin Rosenberg of the University of Chicago and with Prof. Charles Schwartz of the University of California at Berkeley. The SACC also is cooperating with the revolutionary Students for a Democratic Society and the Socialist Scholars.

Under the alleged moral justification that scientists and engineers should refuse to take part in "destructive" military research, the plotters against an American ABM system and U.S. military defense are trying to persuade such professionals to divorce themselves from U.S. government-sponsored activities.

In the light of the Soviet military invasion of Czechoslovakia, of the growing Soviet nuclear threat in space and on the seas, including the Mediterranean, the American people ought to inform themselves about the true aim of all intellectuals sponsoring the March 4 strike of scientists and engineers. The only ones who could possibly benefit from such a strike are our Communist foes. Those certain to suffer from impaired U.S. military defense are American men, women and children.

THE HOPELESS COMMITTEE

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in a timely editorial today's New York Times points out the ludicrousness of rechristening the House Un-American Activities Committee. The new name will not change its character, but the broadened mandate proposed in House Resolution 89 will extend its jurisdiction and, the sponsors hope, render it less subject to judicial review. Instead of giving this committee greater latitude to indulge in its familiar tactics, the House should write a finis to its 30-year career. The New York Times observes, "Like the committee itself, this proposal is wholly without merit."

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 18, 1969]

THE HOPELESS COMMITTEE

The House of Representatives considers today a resolution to change the name of the Un-American Activities Committee and redefine its mandate. Like the committee itself, this proposal is wholly without merit. It would obviously do no good to change its embarrassing name to the more decorous "Committee on Internal Security" if the committee does not also change its ways.

Representative Richard Ichord of Missouri, the committee's new chairman and sponsor of the proposal to rechristen it and restate its jurisdiction has candidly conceded that the principal purpose of the redefinition is to assist the committee in its endless jousting with the courts. Mr. Ichord believes that the present "vague language is in part responsible for the many restrictive court decisions."

Certainly the groups record in and out of the courts is dismal. Of the 133 contempt citations issued by the committee between 1950 and 1966, only nine resulted in convictions. In the last quarter of a century, it has reported only five bills that became law. Yet every year it gets what is a huge appropriation by comparison with other Congressional committees. Its staff of 46 persons, for example, is more than twice as large

as that of the Ways and Means Committee which considers roughly one-fifth of all the bills introduced in the House every year.

Even by its own misguided standards, the committee is a failure. The only real function it seems to serve is to provide publicity and a platform for various crackpots and fanatics of both the extreme left and the extreme right.

Many members of the House are backing a substitute offered by Representative John Culver of Iowa to transform HUAC into a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. This would be a modest improvement. But the House would do better to admit after more than thirty years of collisions with the courts that "un-American" and "subversive" are terms that defy definitions. By any name, this is a hopeless committee on a hopeless quest.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND THE RIGHT TO DISSENT: THE SEPARATION OF LIBERTY AND LICENSE

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the right to dissent is precious to Western civilization, and to American democracy. Indeed, we believe, it is not only the right, but also the duty, of citizens to speak out on issues in which they have either strong interest or moral concern. Our greatest patriots and philosophers have encouraged us conscientiously to perform this duty. Jefferson declared that the tree of liberty must periodically be watered by the blood of patriots, even as Thoreau pronounced it "not desirable to cultivate a respect for law so much as for the right." We have, as a nation, been molded by the individualistic concept of self-determination and self-reliance. Thus did Emerson declare, in the spirit of frontier America:

To believe your own thought, to believe that what is true for you in your private heart is true for all men—that is genius.

Translated into political terms, this means, according to J. R. Wiggins:

That there is . . . a duty [to dissent from the policy of government when that policy seems to the individual citizen to constitute a departure from national interest or moral rectitude]—that . . . such a duty . . . is the very essence of self-government, the very vital spark of a democratic system. A people devoid of this impulse would make the form of government a matter of indifference. And a people with this impulse will invest even the most unsatisfactory system of government with the vigor and force that may make it adequate to deal with society's problem.

An aspect of proper dissent which has particular relevance to the current situation is academic freedom—the birthright of the student population, which is the privilege of speaking one's mind freely, in regard to all topics—including current political issues. The right to academic freedom has been considered sacred by Western democracy, and men have given their lives in its defense.

On the other hand, however, the American heritage is one which emphasizes the importance of law and order,

of representative government, of majority rule.

Theodore Roosevelt declared in a classic statement:

No man is above the law and no man is below it, nor do we ask any man's permission when we require him to obey it.

Or, as Joseph H. Choate explained:

Law is the expression and the perfection of common sense.

How, then, to reconcile these differing traditions is the problem which confronts us today—a problem not easily resolved.

An article by Washington Post Editor J. R. Wiggins delineates with perception the fine line which must be drawn between proper dissent and its abuse, between liberty and license. Mr. Wiggins relates that in five instances in our Nation's history, popular dissent has altered the course of national policy, forcing a reversal of legislative intent or executive direction. Mr. Wiggins writes:

Such was the case in 1804, when a Republican defeat of the Federalists nullified the Alien and Sedition laws. In 1808 it occurred when the Republicans gave in to hot resistance over the Embargo Act. . . . The election of Lincoln climaxed a long period of rising dissent against the pro-slavery policies of the Federal Government [while] the Civil War—the very embodiment and ultimate in dissent—reversed the national policy and put slavery on the way to extinction. The repeal of the 18th Amendment was another reversal of national policy coerced by the collapse of enforcement in a rising volume of dissent, disobedience and defiance of the law.

The fifth instance cited by Mr. Wiggins, the dissent of civil rights advocates, has already significantly altered Government policy and Federal legislation.

In short, the acceptable kind of dissent, which may be applied toward alteration of Government policy and Federal legislation, has generally been defined as that which cannot find redress under the law—a cause set forth in defense of morality, a cause which uses techniques of dissent which neither produce violence nor infringe upon the rights of others. Thus, in some cases, peaceable assembly and demonstration may be condoned as proposed methods of dissent. It may be observed that in at least two instances in our history, either violence or disobedience have impinged upon the scene—the former in the Civil War, the latter in rejection of the 18th amendment. While both obtain general sanction in retrospect, we would not wish to repeat them today—the prospects of either another Civil War or renewed prohibition are now unthinkable and were, indeed, unique products of unique times.

Thus, the case of current student revolt, civil disobedience, and outright riot—seems somewhat different from the previous five cases cited. For indeed, much of the current dissension—led by both white and black activists—is no more than a crude rejection of all legal processes, a determination to abridge the right to free speech for all but the dissenters. Instead of asking to be heard, instead of using the means of peaceable

demonstration and responsible political activity in seeking their goals, these people seem bent upon shouting down their opponents while demanding instant achievement of their demands by whatever means possible—democratic or not. These are the people, writes columnist Max Lerner, who are victims of what he calls instantism—who want “instant victory over the enemy, instant justice, instant vindication of ancient wrongs, instant power.” For these people there is neither yesterday nor tomorrow, but only the single dimension of today. And these are the people whom the chancellor of UCLA defines as unable to draw the fine line between personal freedom of choice on the one hand and social necessity on the other. And as former HEW Secretary John Gardner has concluded:

How can we make people understand that if they expect all good things instantly they will destroy everything? . . . Dissent is an element of dynamism in our system. It is good that men expect much of their institutions, and good that their aspirations for improvement are ardent. . . . [But] violence cannot build a better society. No society can live in constant and destructive tumult. . . . The anarchist plays into the hands of the authoritarian. . . . The elements of dynamism must have stabilizing counterparts. . . .

Again, Mr. Wiggins hits the nail squarely on the head:

There have been frequent demonstrations in which violence has been used to disrupt public meetings and interfere with speakers. This is a technique perfected by the Fascists and the Nazis. Those who are in dissent ought to be the last to encourage a contest in which the side with the most numbers and least scruples is bound ultimately to triumph.

Furthermore, he warns:

those in dissent, if they are at all farsighted, should be the first to demand for those who speak in opposition to them full personal security. The business of breaking heads is not an enterprise involving so much ingenuity that others cannot be instructed in it or learn to profit by it, if it becomes one of the necessities of public life.

Thus the right to dissent has, of late, been interpreted as the right to disruption of order, destruction of property, and curtailment of the rights of others. What we are witnessing is, essentially, a breakdown in discipline, a refusal by the minority to accept the limitations which proper dissent must take in an orderly society. We see in the ascendant a spirit which holds that any law may be violated at will—not only because it may, or may not, in the eyes of the protester, be immoral, but also, by implication, because it happens to curtail the pursuit of pleasure, or money, or any other desirable end. Thus, murder, arson, extortion, rape—by logical extension, all acts are permissible, and we have arrived, like Dostoevsky's Inquisitor, at a point beyond good and evil, at a point where all things are allowed.

In this connection—

Writes George F. Kennan, by way of parenthesis—

There are some people, who accept our political system, [who] believe that they have a right to disregard it and to violate the laws that have flowed from it so long as they are

prepared, as a matter of conscience, to accept the penalties established for such behavior.

These are not the disrupters of free speech, the looters and burners, but the sincerely conscientious who feel that civil disobedience is the most practical way of changing what are to them immoral laws. Civil disobedience is not new to America. It has attained some respectability. But I would warn of its potential danger: For what may pass as civil disobedience today may become indiscriminate antinomianism tomorrow. And once again, I quote Mr. Kennan:

The violation of law is not, in the moral and philosophic sense, a privilege that lies offered for sale with a given price tag, like an object in a supermarket, available to anyone who has the price and is willing to pay for it. It is not like the privilege of breaking crockery in a tent at the county fair for a quarter a shot. Respect for the law is not an obligation which is exhausted or obliterated by willingness to accept the penalty for breaking it.

What, then, may properly be expected of those who feel called to responsible dissent, whose watchful vigor is essential to the conduct of responsible government?

Mr. Wiggins writes:

Of these citizens [I would reply] the Government is entitled to ask forms of dissent and disagreement that comply with our traditions—speech within the limits of parliamentary utterance, actions in conformity with laws adopted by due process. The exact limits on both speech and actions may fluctuate with the occasion, but there surely is a line beyond which such citizens ought not to proceed if they count themselves within the community that does not intend or propose the revolutionary overthrow of this Government by force and violence.

For if the right to dissent is the property of the minority, the right to conform is the right of the majority. These two—minority and majority—do not exist singly but together; and neither can for long survive without the sufferance of the other. Thus—to those who would invoke the sacred name of academic freedom for the purpose of anarchistic violence, let me caution that the minority is always first to lose when the force and validity of law breaks down. But it is also true that if the minority is usurped by the majority, what was formerly the majority is, ipso facto, no longer such. Democracy is a dialectic between the greater and the lesser, and can never be anything else.

Thus, the natural successor to anarchy is tyranny; and, indeed, experience has taught that the primary victims of authoritarianism are all too often the students and intellectuals that have championed the cause of minority rights. The recent unhappy events in Poland serve to illustrate this point only too well. Academic freedom and proper dissent can survive as viable means for promoting change only so long as their proper limits within the boundary of law are respected—by those who invoke their names in the cause of reform. It is reason, not emotion, which must prevail, if American democracy is not to vanish in the smoke of violence and destruction.

**NEW KIMBERLY-CLARK PLANT
BRINGS AUTOMATION, MODERN
PEOPLE POLICIES TO BEECH IS-
LAND AREA**

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess I had the pleasure and privilege of participating in the dedication of the new consumer products plant built by the Kimberly-Clark Corp., at Beech Island, in my congressional district.

It was a matter of pride to me to hear Mr. Guy M. Minard, president of Kimberly-Clark, say in his dedication speech that this new plant will be automated and have two of the fastest tissue-making machines in the world. This will contribute greatly to the industrial progress of my area.

But I was especially interested in the enlightened remarks of Mr. Minard on what he called "people planning," a viewpoint of industry that will make our new Kimberly-Clark plant a center for social progress as well as manufacturing efficiency.

The substance of Mr. Minard's speech will be of interest, Mr. Speaker, to you and our colleagues, and I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF GUY M. MINARD, PRESIDENT,
KIMBERLY-CLARK CORP.

It is a pleasure to be here today because I feel I'm among very good friends. Kimberly-Clark has received a cordial and helpful welcome to this community and in the South. We are most appreciative. Important things can be accomplished when companies and communities work together as closely and enthusiastically as we have been able to work with you.

At Beech Island, Kimberly-Clark has built one of the country's most advanced paper products plants. The planning for its development began many years ago by men who were keenly aware of the growth potential of our industry. They projected Kimberly-Clark's pattern of expansion, analyzed the operations of all other company mills to isolate the best of these for Beech Island, studied dozens of possible plant sites, and took a hard look at the eastern seaboard market for the products we make now and may make in the future.

Kimberly-Clark has introduced many new ideas in product manufacturing, packaging and handling at Beech Island. For example, the two tissue-making machines here are the fastest in the world. We designed them, and the principle will soon be applied at many of the company's other plants throughout the country. We are proud to have developed a number of other new systems and techniques and to have brought them together here in a highly efficient and productive plant.

At Kimberly-Clark, however, we believe that the tools of production are only one element of growth. Today, I would like to discuss with you another aspect of business success that's not exactly related to markets or machinery. That element is people.

In the early years of this country, you had to own or control real estate if you wanted to enjoy economic power. This was the case until the Industrial Revolution when capital replaced land as the factor that did the most to stimulate progress. Later, as industry de-

veloped, growth began to hinge on invention, technology, and scientific break-throughs.

Now a new swing in emphasis seems to be gaining momentum. Economic progress is beginning to focus on human resources and their effective organization and use. More companies are starting to think more about people, and to recognize their technicians, managers, production workers, scientists and executives as perhaps the most critical elements of industrial development.

We all know that good human talent is not very easy to come by. True, there are more people in this country than ever before, but the demand for qualified workers still is running ahead of supply. And according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the labor force will grow more slowly in the near future than it did in the recent past. A capable man, in other words, not only is hard to find; he is getting harder to find.

However, I think there are some interesting and realistic solutions to the diminishing supply of good workers and good managers in industry.

Some months ago, the National Industrial Conference Board asked mayors of major cities to indicate where business can make the most significant contribution to jobs, job training, and education. The mayors pointed out several things companies might do to improve their performance in this area:

They should adjust job entry requirements, considering the potential and not just the credentials of the worker. They should create educational programs and on-the-job training designed to close the gap between the disadvantaged and other employees or potential employees. And they should help establish close liaison with local vocational schools both in terms of guidance counseling and the provision of teaching aid and equipment.

Although the occasion to put these ideas to work exists in many business situations, a particularly good opportunity can be found at the many new industrial plants now being built throughout the United States.

By way of example, I would like to mention some of the work we have done here at Beech Island that indicates to me this kind of "people planning" is realistic.

Before ground was broken, Kimberly-Clark prepared a list of objectives for the personnel program at Beech Island that we felt would contribute to the plant's success, both in a social and a business sense.

One of these objectives is a work environment in which the individual will make a maximum contribution so that he and the company will realize maximum return on his work. You might suggest that anyone would be foolish not to have this as an objective. But it's not as easy as it sounds. For one thing, traditional paper mill job organization structures are too rigid for the atmosphere we are trying to create.

So in the place of the traditional and somewhat restraining job progressions, we have established a "cluster concept" of jobs that group several pay levels into one work assignment. A man can be advanced within this system even if no vacancy exists at the time—an opportunity we consider very important to motivation and results.

A second objective is the maximum utilization of this community's labor force. As has been our practice, Kimberly-Clark transferred relatively few people to Beech Island from other areas, and we have not hired experienced operators from local paper mills. This means that special planning for technical training was called for, especially because a large portion of the job applications we received here represented labor unskilled in our kind of technology.

In a number of cases, on-the-job training programs for certain newly hired technicians were established at other Kimberly-Clark

mills to provide important operating experience. In others, we worked with vocational and technical schools in this area to help create special training courses for fields in which we were hiring. In all instances, we hired workers who appeared to have high potential without regard to the level of formal training they had achieved. We find this policy yields excellent results in terms of production as well as employee loyalty.

A third objective is free and open communication between management and employees at all levels of the mill operating force. We wanted every employee to have a clear understanding of the purpose and the effect of his work. There is no formalized procedure for communication between management and labor—they just talk. We think this policy is paying off handsomely in terms of understanding.

A fourth objective is complete integration of minority group workers at all levels in the mill and an environment in which they can feel comfortable and confident both when they come here seeking a job and later as members of our team.

As a step toward this goal, we established specific objectives for the employment of minority groups at all levels of the plant organization, including the professional staffs. Department directors are responsible for meeting these targets. Then specialized training programs were worked out in cooperation with the South Carolina vocational and technical school system and with the Augusta Area Technical School to ensure that these employees would have every opportunity to contribute fully. I'm proud to report that this program has already proved highly successful in every respect.

These four examples represent nearly a dozen objectives aimed at creating meaningful employment and a productive mill operation.

I think they are particularly appropriate for discussion at the dedication of a new plant, because new facilities offer new opportunities for working with people creatively.

And the opportunities are growing. Business spending for expansion continues to set records, and this year's projections indicate that total spending will increase by 10 per cent over 1968. Industry is going to build more than 14,000 new facilities with this money in 1969.

Each of these new plants offers a fresh environment for new techniques in forward planning for personnel. And taken as a group, the plants provide a vast arena in which better ways of training, hiring and integrating workers could be tested.

If industry, in establishing these new manufacturing centers, would plan as carefully for people as it does for production, a great many of the industry's and the nation's personnel problems could be diminished or defeated right in the factory.

The companies that put people resources to best use in the decades ahead probably will be the ones that emerge as the leaders in their industries. That's the direction we have taken, at any rate, at Beech Island.

At the outset, Kimberly-Clark located here for selfish reasons—for what the area and its people could do for us. But after that decision was made, we dug very deeply into what contributions we possibly could make in return.

I think you might make a loose comparison of our program here with the well known industrial technique usually called "promoting from within." We're building our own team from within our own community, and we fully expect that team to grow and prosper with us.

This, we feel, brings to Beech Island and vicinity a new opportunity for a great number of people to develop new skills, improve

their economic status, and build a stronger and more secure future. It's a policy that, in the long run, should pay good dividends for us all.

Thank you.

DR. DUBRIDGE GIVES EXCELLENT STATEMENT

HON. JAMES C. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Lee A. Dubridge, Director, Office of Science and Technology, today gave an excellent presentation before the Subcommittee on Science Research and Development of the Science and Astronautics Committee.

As the ranking minority member of that committee and a long-time admirer of Dr. Dubridge, it is a pleasure for me to place his fine statement in the *Record* today:

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Subcommittee: The House Science and Astronautics Committee is devoted to the welfare of science and technology in the United States. So am I. The hearings you are now having are for the purpose of seeking ways to strengthen American science, to strengthen scientific education, and to strengthen the foundations on which these activities are built—namely the American colleges and universities. Because you are already devoted to these goals, I do not have to persuade you of their importance. But you and I are well aware of the fact that not all American people are as committed to the welfare of science and of our universities as you and I are. Therefore, I am requesting the privilege today of speaking—not so much to you, the members of this committee—but through you to the American people.

The confusion which exists in our nation today about the goals and values of science and technology is in a certain sense understandable. We as a nation are confused and troubled on many fronts and on many issues. We are troubled by a costly war in a far distant land. We are troubled by our less than cordial relations with many other nations and peoples on this tiny planet—a planet which seems especially tiny as viewed through the eyes and the cameras of the Apollo 8 astronauts. We are distressed by the troubles in our cities, about the unhappy relations between black and white Americans, about the breakdown of the peaceful and scholarly atmospheres in our schools and colleges. We are distressed by air pollution, water pollution, about the disaster to the Santa Barbara beaches, about noise and traffic on our streets and in the air. The list of our worries unfortunately is almost endless. And many of these worries are closely interrelated.

So it is not surprising, in these troubled times, that many people ask: What is science doing for us? Isn't it true that science and technology are the cause of many of our troubles? Can't we devote our energies and our money to more urgent problems? Why support our colleges when the students themselves—or some of them—do not support them? And, indeed, when some of the faculty have turned against them?

Yes, we live in troubled times. And yet it is necessary for responsible people to stop denouncing our ills and take a long look at where we are—where we have been in the

past years—and where we hope to be going in the decades that lie ahead.

If we take a long look back, we can see some astonishing things that have taken place.

Would you trade places today with anyone—rich or poor—who lived on this globe say, 400 years ago? If you think we have poverty today—as indeed we do—read about the poverty-stricken masses in Europe of 400 or 200 or 100 years ago. If you decry the wars and fears of war today, think of the continuous wars that have raged on this earth for thousands of years. If you are unhappy that our schools are not doing as good a job as we think they should, think of the day when education was almost unknown to most people, even in the so-called advanced countries.

If you are saddened by the ravages of illness and disease and inadequate medical care, think of the days not too long ago when human illness was taken for granted, when the most devastating epidemics and plagues went almost wholly unchecked, when medical science had hardly advanced beyond the stage of the witch doctor. And I need not remind you that the material comforts of life which even the poorest person in this country enjoys today are far beyond the wildest hopes the kings and emperors of 200 years ago.

What has happened that has made these profound changes possible? What has happened is that about 300 years ago a few men began to use their brains and their imaginations to seek a better understanding of nature—of the world in which we live—of the universe about us and about the nature and constitution of our own bodies. Instead of wondering idly about what made stones fall, the stars move, crops to fail or illness to befall, men began to ask questions of nature. How do these things happen? Can we understand why they happen? Can we learn enough to predict what things will happen in the future?

The great pioneers of this human intellectual adventure soon came to a surprising conclusion: Nature is not haphazard or fickle; nature is not wholly mysterious; nature operates in regular ways in accordance with what we call natural laws. Furthermore, the human mind is capable of discovering these laws and using them to interpret the phenomena that are observed, to predict, in certain circumstances, and in a given system, what will happen next.

Men, in short, discovered science; invented the scientific method. The age of science began. A new era of human adventure and of human progress was ushered in. The power of prediction is one of the outstanding successes of science.

But man was not content just to know the laws of motion and of gravitation and of energy. He soon saw that he could use these laws to do things he had never done before. He could make steam do his work for him—run his machines, propel his ships and vehicles, lift mighty loads, pull his plows across the fields. Understanding energy, he began to ask about the energy of the human body. Whence does it come? What kind of processes convert the food and water and air which a man takes in to the muscular work which he can put out?

Now once man had learned how to acquire knowledge and use it, things began to change. And as more knowledge was acquired, the rate of change accelerated. More knowledge accelerated the rate of acquiring still more knowledge; accelerated the rate at which knowledge could be put to use. This acceleration is still going on today. The more we learn, the more we glimpse the vast sea of ignorance that lies ahead. But also the more rapidly do we conquer these areas of ignorance.

And so in our own generation (at least in mine!) the modern scientific-technological society has been born. We can now make machines to perform almost any desired task—even going to the moon. We can, through our knowledge of chemistry, make almost any material we want to suit our purposes, including these complex systems of molecules essential to life. We have evolved and used the complex rules of mathematics to solve a host of problems. Our geologists explore the earth, find new resources, trace the history of our planet, and map its unreachable interior. The engineer uses all of these pieces of new knowledge, fits them together and designs and builds a host of things for men to use, from skyscrapers to electric can openers, and at a cost that people can afford to pay.

In the meantime, the physicists have explored deep into the nucleus of the atom—and discovered an unbelievable array of mysteries—plus an incredible new source of energy. The chemists string atoms together to make even the most complex compounds, including those that are essential to life itself. And our astronomers lift our eyes to the stars, show us 100 billion galaxies, each containing 100 billion stars—stretching out into space untold billions of billions of miles, stretching back into time a dozen billion years or more.

And, most startling of all, the chemists, biologists and medical men have uncovered some of the deepest secrets of life itself—the nature of the genetic code, the mechanisms of bodily functions, the causes of most diseases, the sources of health and sickness. And they are now beginning to understand a little bit about the mechanism of the human brain. We have conquered a host of once dread diseases—although heart disease, cancer and some others, including the Hong Kong flu and the common cold, still remain to afflict us—and pose mysteries to challenge us.

Yes, from the material point of view we are vastly more comfortable and healthy than any preceding generation.

But have the benefits been only material? I answer a resounding No.

Can a man be quite the same when he has learned of the distant galaxies and has watched other men circle the moon? Can a man fail to increase his respect for the power, dignity and value of every human being when he sees what the human intellect, when driven by a desire to know, can achieve? Is not a man who can penetrate the mysteries of the atom also one who enhances the dignity and worth of all human beings? Is it an accident that the growth of the ideal of a democratic society—based on the dignity of man—has been coincident with the advance of knowledge? Is it not significant that we who live better lives than any of our ancestors have still higher ideals than they could ever have dreamed—dreams of a still better life for all men? In many ways our human and our humane ideals and goals have moved ahead faster than our physical and intellectual abilities to achieve them. Our moral ideas have gone faster than scientific advance, and not the reverse, as some people claim. We no longer are willing to accept the thesis that man was inevitably born into a vale of tears. We insist that he must eventually inherit a land of peace and happiness.

And here we come to the great paradox of our time.

Our success in the search for knowledge and in applying it has far exceeded the wildest dreams of our fathers and mothers. But we want more—much more. We can conquer some diseases, why not all? We can go to the moon. Why can't we clean up our cities? We can fly to Europe in a few hours. Why can't we get to the airport quickly?

The world could grow many times as much food as it needs. Why is there still hunger? We have built a vast educational system that most of the world envies. Why can't we make it still better adapted to match our new needs and our new ideals?

We have, in short, been so successful in many fields that we can no longer tolerate failure in any others.

The automobile is such a marvelous engineering achievement that every one needs and desires one. So our streets are clogged and our air is polluted, and we slaughter each other on our highways at a staggering rate.

We have been so successful in removing the heavy burdens of hard labor which have plagued men for thousands of years that we no longer need unskilled labor at all and our undereducated citizens are out of work.

Our factories, our buildings, our bridges and our highways are far more skillfully designed than ever before, but they still often offend our ever growing sense of the need for more beauty in our environment. The people have forgotten the soft coal smoke of 30 years ago, and which has now disappeared in most U.S. cities.

And so it goes. As we pile success on success in our scientific and technological achievements, we are more and more conscious that our success so far is woefully inadequate.

Is it that we have too much knowledge and have developed too much skill in using it?

Certainly not!

We are only beginning in our search for knowledge. We are still groping to find more effective and more thoughtful and considerate ways of using it.

We can reduce air and water pollution—but we need to know more; and we need to discover new ways of using what we do know.

We can abolish poverty—but we must find ways of more effectively addressing the mind of man to the problem.

Our intellectual resources—not our material resources—are the limits to what we can achieve.

Therefore, as we look to the future, we must do more than invent stopgap measures to meet current and urgent crises. We must educate our people better especially those with gifted and imaginative minds. We must intensify our search for more knowledge. We must enhance our efforts to carry on effective research in science, engineering, social science and other scholarly fields.

We are, of course, properly impatient to solve more rapidly our social problems. And greater efforts to apply what knowledge we have to this task are necessary. But here we meet a common fallacy. We hear it said that if we only spent as much money on the problems as we did on the atomic bomb project or on our space program, we could quickly solve our urban crisis. But let us not forget that we launched the Manhattan project and the space program only *after* and not *before* the efforts in basic research over the previous 30 or 40 years had uncovered the knowledge which showed us *how* we could build atomic bombs and launch payloads into space. In these programs we *used* the knowledge we had largely already acquired. Neither the Manhattan Program nor the space program could have even been dreamed of ten years before they started, because we did not *know* enough to even formulate a development program.

In many, though not all, of our present crises we are in the same position so far as technology is concerned. We do not know enough about certain technologies, and we certainly do not know enough about many social phenomena to justify mounting a concentrated, technically based attack on these problems. We must, of course, enhance our

short-term relief measures to relieve immediate suffering and injustice. But at the same time we must encourage and support new efforts to learn more, to extend our base of fundamental knowledge in science, technology and social science, so that we can move sure-footedly toward long-term solutions.

We often think that new technological devices or new social inventions spring suddenly from the minds of a great inventor or from a massive new effort. But in every case the inventor had built upon a vast base of fundamental knowledge that had grown out of the basic research endeavors of previous generations of scholars. The electric light of Thomas Edison would have been impossible without the previous work of Faraday, Maxwell and many others on the nature of electricity and magnetism. The transistor would have been impossible to conceive had it not been for the work of those who developed the quantum theory twenty or more years before—and they in turn built on the work of their predecessors twenty or thirty years before that.

Radio, television, the automobile, the airplane and all the other marvels of modern technology similarly stem from the results of basic research in physics and chemistry which long antedated these apparently "new" inventions. Similarly our modern methods of curing many diseases and alleviating much human suffering were made possible by the work of physicists, chemists, biochemists and biologists stretching back 50 to 100 years. Research carried on by many patient men who studied such unalluring things as fruit flies and sea urchin eggs led to our modern knowledge of cell growth and of genetics—knowledge which is basic to medical progress toward the cure of new ailments.

I trust I have given enough examples to illustrate my point: knowledge must be acquired before knowledge can be put to use so that we can solve the many problems that stand in the way of creating a better life for all people.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I come to the point which is of interest to this committee in these hearings. Whence comes the basic knowledge we need and whence come the trained people who can gain more knowledge and put our existing knowledge to work? From our great colleges and universities, of course. Our fine system of higher education—with all its faults which are so raucously evident today—is still our hope for the future. Until we find new ways of strengthening our universities—through better public understanding of their function and importance and through greater public and private support—we cannot hope to make it possible for us—and those who come after us—to find causes and cures for our ills.

Our universities today are overwhelmed with problems. Student enrollments have grown much more rapidly than funds could be found for new classrooms, laboratories, libraries, educational programs, and for operating expenses. Inflationary forces have struck cruel blows at many plans for improving facilities and curricula. The worries of a troubled world have impinged on our campuses and given rise to student revolts against the establishment which has allowed such things to happen. A university, which never before had the need to build a police force and a court of justice, finds itself helpless in the face of a massive uprising. A few students and non-students, small in numbers but strong in influence, have sensed the underlying discontent and have capitalized on it—much as Hitler capitalized on the discontent in pre-war Germany. And an aggrieved citizenry, outraged at the scenes of violence on our campuses, has turned away from the university, denounced it, withdrawn its support, just at the moment when public

support and understanding were most needed. Meanwhile, the great mass of students have real problems that must be constructively approached.

The purpose of your bill, H.R. 35, Mr. Chairman, as I interpret it, is to do something to strengthen our universities at a time when we need them the most. You would be the last to claim that this bill, if passed, would solve all the problems of higher education. There are many things that need to be done to open educational opportunities to all qualified students, to build adequate facilities, and to encourage innovative educational programs, to enhance and improve advanced study and research programs in the humanities, the arts, the social sciences as well as the natural sciences, and to insure the fiscal stability of our whole educational system.

The present Administration, led by the deep concern of President Nixon about these matters, is now studying the ways in which private and public funding can most effectively be mobilized—and public opinion can be mobilized—in support of our great institutions of learning. The President has expressed his conviction that the search for knowledge is not only one of the highest and noblest enterprises of the human species, but is also essential to our survival as a great and free society. President Nixon and his Cabinet officers and staff are now seeking to evolve long-range programs to achieve, not only through a federal but through a national effort, the goal we all seek of making higher education and research an even more powerful force for good in our country.

I compliment you and your distinguished committee for its devoted effort to find some method of relieving one segment of higher education—the scientific segment—of some of the serious problems we face. Thank you.

CHALLENGE TO WORLD HUNGER

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for the average American to feel any sense of alarm or even concern that the specter of hunger is very real and growing each day throughout the world. Our food supplies are so abundant and so diversified at home that this is understandable. And we would like to keep it that way.

One avenue of promise lies in our continuing support of the ingenious work of agricultural scientists—in the State agricultural experiment stations and our industrial and national laboratories—who are adding fantastic new stories to the brilliant annals of our agricultural science record.

In the January 24, 1969, issue of Life magazine, a select group of these experiments with vivid accompanying photographs will startle and please anyone. Here is some of the most unique scheming with nature's tools—sun, water, seed, insect, leaf, bacteria: hypergrowth of the sweet potato in blue light; bubble blowing in corn fields; chemotherapy to help crops survive killing droughts; and incredible oil-eating bacteria that produce protein as nourishing as steak.

This is forward-looking research of the most basic yet most practical kind. I want to make a special point of the hope that such research engenders for human welfare.

Excerpts of the article referred to are inserted herewith, and I am pleased to commend the author, Alicia Hills Moore:

NEW CHALLENGES TO WORLD HUNGER

Awash in blue light, imprisoned in a crenulated greenhouse, the sweet potato plant at right is being pushed to the very limits of its productivity. By manipulating its environment, scientists at the Battelle Memorial Institute in Ohio have turned it into a kind of super-plant, an adventurer on the frontiers of hyper-growth. It is here, in these uncharted and exotic regions, that the answer to the cruellest human tragedy of our time—death by starvation—is being sought and may, eventually, be found.

Last year on this planet, 60 million people died. Nearly two-thirds of those deaths were related, in one way or another, to hunger. During the same 12 months, 118 million were born into the world, most of them in underdeveloped countries already short of food. By the end of this century, the world's population is expected to total more than six billion, twice what it is now. Some experts warn that food production must triple in the next three decades, a seemingly impossible task, just to keep up. Despite the recent success of high-yield rice and wheat in Asia, others predict that even before then there will be a worldwide famine.

Without effective birth control—and most authorities feel this is unlikely on a worldwide basis in the 20th Century—there seems no way to break the cycle of being born to starve, crippled physically, and even mentally, by a lack of adequate protein. Yet now an extraordinary new surge of scientific discovery promises to shatter this tragic cycle.

The innermost mysteries of sun and water, of seed and insect and leaf, are being probed by a remarkable band of researchers—botanists, biologists, nutritionists and even space scientists—in search of ways to get more food out of what we grow. At the same time, they are working to develop completely new techniques for extracting nourishment from new and unusual sources.

The scope of their work ranges from the esoteric of pure science to the rattle of manure-stained heavy machinery. Working with corn seedlings, they have identified a hitherto unknown substance that actually controls and orders the steps in a plant's growth cycle. Borrowing from the textile industry, they have put spinning equipment to use turning protein-rich substances into foods that look and taste like chicken and beef. On the following pages Life examines some of the discoveries now being made in this field where, today, hope and need are synonymous.

BUILDING A BETTER CORNFIELD WITH GRIDS AND BUBBLE MAKERS

Photosynthesis is the way green plants—and only green plants—use the sun's light to transform carbon dioxide and water into the chemical compounds the human body needs for growth and energy. Though crucial to all life on earth, the process is not highly efficient—no more than 5% of the solar energy available is converted into useful compounds. A good bit goes to sustain the plant, but even in the most efficient species—such as corn—there is substantial waste. To learn how to reduce such waste and make the conversion of solar to edible energy more efficient, U.S. Department of Agriculture and Cornell University scientists have instrumented an entire cornfield in upstate New York. Using soap bubbles, growth

charts, artificial light and a specially designed air-sampling frame, they have meticulously plotted the photosynthesis process. Among other things, they have found that certain kinds of artificial light can make corn more productive and that even distant storm centers, by affecting wind currents, can influence the CO₂ supply—and hence the growth rate. Employing similar research methods, the investigators have also been able to gauge the operating efficiency of the dozens of varieties of corn planted in their instrumented field. This kind of precise and detailed information makes it possible to crossbreed specifically for better photosynthesis—something researchers have never been able to do before.

CHEMICALS TO MAKE A PLANT STOP WASTING WATER

Because of the delicate nature of living things, plant doctors must have a perfect sense of botanical balance—they must be able to improve productivity without upsetting natural growth. Green plants, for example, take in carbon dioxide through thousands of tiny mouths—known as stomata—in the surface of their leaves. Yet at the same time they allow equally indispensable water to escape in the form of vapor. As much as two thirds of all rainfall is wasted in this way, researchers estimate, and the loss may be as much as 3,800 gallons of water a day for an acre of corn. Even a small fraction of the lost vapor would be worth saving. At the Agricultural Experiment Station in New Haven, biochemists treating corn leaves with a variety of special chemicals have succeeded in making leaf pores remain half closed even in bright sunshine, conserving water but not seriously affecting the intake of CO₂. The widespread use of such plant chemotherapy could help crops survive killing droughts—and make it possible to farm some semiarid land that is not now tillable.

With more exotic chemical treatments and a full understanding of photosynthesis, some scientists believe they may even be able to control the way plants use oxygen and CO₂—and thereby increase their nutritional value. Thus a lush but nutritionally poor patch of jungle could conceivably be transformed into a food-rich "farm" simply by spraying it from the air.

NEED TO PIN DOWN THE DETAILS OF AN APHID'S HABIT? JUST BUG THE BUG

After years of using massive amounts of insecticides—and still losing some \$4 billion worth of crops annually—scientists are beginning to fight the battle of the parasite with biology as well as chemistry. They have found, for example, that an insect can be forced to "grow to death" with a dose of its own hormones and that flashes of light in the middle of the night can upset some insect feeding patterns. Much of the experimentation leading to such discoveries is bizarre, but seldom has any been stranger than the bug-bugging operations shown here. The tiny insect in question is the aphid, a notorious spreader of viral diseases. In minutes, an aphid can fly to two or three plants, drawing virus from one and spreading it to others. To find out what goes on when an aphid stops to eat, Dr. G. A. Schaefer of Cornell University wired up one of the insects, turning it into a switch in a delicate electric circuit. Dr. Schaefer first hooked the leaf of a strawberry plant (above) to a small battery, then attached a gold wire 1/10,000 of an inch thick to an aphid and, via a metal washer (far right), to a recording machine. Thus when an aphid put its feeding tube between the cells of the plant (magnified about 1,500 times at right), it closed the circuit. By attaching a graph pen to an amplifier, Dr. Schaefer was then able

to plot the aphid's actual feeding sequence and calculate the exact moments at which plant juices—and possibly viruses—were flowing into the insect's digestive tract. Now, he is looking for ways to upset the sequence. One possibility is to use elements that occur naturally in some plants and make them unappetizing to aphids, wired up or otherwise.

A BOTANICAL TRIUMPH THAT COULD TURN CORN INTO A MAIN COURSE

Proteins are indispensable—they are crucial to early growth and development and they help rebuild and repair our tissues as we age. Yet proteins are complex compounds and the body can't put them to work unless all the elements that make them up are present. These building blocks are known as amino acids. The body itself is capable of making some amino acids, but others—the essential ones—only appear in adequate amounts in outside sources such as meat and dairy foods. Green plants can provide certain of them too, but no single plant has all of the essential amino acids in quantity. For this reason a person in a country without the agricultural resources to raise livestock can gorge himself on wheat or rice alone and still be starving for protein.

Missing amino acids can be supplied artificially—by mixing particular crops like soybeans and corn together so that they complement each other or by adding amino acids in synthetic form. In a remarkable breakthrough, plant geneticists recently produced a new kind of corn with beef-steak protein bred into it. Edwin Mertz and Oliver Nelson of Purdue University refused to accept what most experts believed: that all types of corn were lacking in certain amino acids, lysine and tryptophan. Together they spent months carefully considering more than 100 different varieties—and finally came up with one that was rich in the two amino acids. By breeding the high-lysine gene from the new corn, called opaque-2, into productive hybrids, they developed a variety that is easily grown, yet has a high protein content. Seeds of the new corn have been shipped to researchers in many countries, including protein-poor nations like Colombia and Kenya. Other Purdue researchers, meanwhile, are using radioactive trace agents to figure out why opaque-2—and no other type of corn—contains adequate amounts of the critical amino acids. If they can explain the mystery, then perhaps other crops can be made to produce a full supply of essential amino acids too.

OIL-EATING BACTERIA AND A HYDRA WHO IS ALL TASTE

Consider this: a pound of bacteria, feeding on a fraction of crude oil so worthless that it is usually burned as waste, can grow fast enough to produce ten pounds of protein in a day. If a yearling calf were able to manufacture protein at the same rate, it would end up the day roughly the size of a three-car garage. And it would have consumed several tons of expensive grain in the process. This comparison may help show why conventional—and largely inefficient—protein production is going to be supplemented by more exotic techniques like farming bacteria, yeasts and other microbes. Already pilot plants in France, Britain and the Soviet Union are in this way turning out micro-organic protein for use in animal feeds.

In the meantime the world is virtually overflowing with other types of protein. Vast quantities of protein-rich organisms inhabit the sea, for example, and green leaves of many kinds can be used as a food source, provided their indigestible cellulose is removed.

No matter how much protein is made available, however, there is still the problem of making it taste good, which in raw form it probably won't. Research in this area has

lately focused on a remarkable substance called glutathione, which has the power to affect the taste buds. To figure out how glutathione works, scientists at the University of Miami have been running tests with a tiny aquatic creature called a hydra, which is practically covered with taste buds. Their eventual hope is to develop a kind of universal flavoring that will make anything appetizing. This may seem implausible, but a hydra has been observed trying to eat a glass rod that had been steeped in glutathione.

HOW TO CONVERT A PECK OF SOYBEANS INTO A POUND OF GROUND ROUND

Although toads, termites and worms are highly acceptable foods in certain parts of Africa and Southeast Asia, few Americans—or anybody other than certain Africans and Southeast Asians—would be inclined to eat them. But what if worms—or fish meal or, for that matter, *Candida Lipolytica*—could be made to look and test like sliced ham or pressed duck? People might still prefer the real thing, but the substitute would be rendered a great deal more attractive. Today in the U.S., facsimile foods—carefully labeled to show what's in them—are being produced, and consumed, in increasing quantities. Using machinery and techniques borrowed from the textile industry, processors are spinning nutritious but unappealing foodstuffs into dozens of edible substitutes. In the picture at right (picture not shown), for example, are (from left) synthetic chicken in chunks and diced; bacon; beef in chunks and ground; and ham in chunks and diced. Made by General Mills, all of them are derived from soybeans like the sackful in the background, and although their taste still won't fool anyone, their color and textures are remarkably like the real thing. The process begins by spinning protein pulp into long, smooth bands of fibers as thin as three thousandths of an inch (below). Changes in fiber size determine texture and, with the addition of nutrients, color and artificial flavors, almost any food can be copied—including, perhaps, something resembling toads, termites and worms.

IN THE WAKE OF STARVATION, A WOUND FOOD CANNOT HEAL

A basic assumption about hunger seems to be that you can always cure it with more food. But no amount of food and special treatment, probably, will ever restore this bloated walf—and millions like him—to full health. Since birth he has suffered from undernourishment, and starvation has wounded him in a deep, subtle, and until recently unsuspected way.

Dr. Joaquin Cravioto is a Mexico City pediatrician with experience in treating infants suffering from the protein-deficiency disease called kwashiorkor. Ten years ago he noticed that even after his most severely affected patients recovered, they seemed dull-witted and did far worse on intelligence tests than other children of their age. Their I.Q. scores ranged as low as 25 points below normal. Further testing in mountain villages in Mexico and Guatemala confirmed his findings: poorly fed infants were consistently less advanced than adequately fed ones.

To explain the phenomenon, several possibilities existed. Underfeeding left children vulnerable to a variety of diseases, while conditions among the poorest families invited attacks by parasites and the effects of exposure. Genetics might also help explain why the malnourished children failed to measure up in intelligence.

But biochemists had yet another answer, a far more ominous one. The human brain accomplishes 80% of its growth in the first three years of life, even though the rest of the body grows to only 20% of adult size in the same period. Beginning in the mother's

womb at approximately the fourth week after conception, the brain starts to develop, producing new cells by means of chemical reactions involving such crucial ingredients as the amino acids. These amino acids, in the womb, supplied by the mother, who derives many of them from the protein in her own diet; after birth, the infant for a time gets them from the protein-rich mother's milk and then from other food. If at any point in the sequence the amino supply is deficient, the brain growth simply slows. Yet the body will not stop growing. Under the stress of inadequate protein, so often a significant factor of poor diet, instead of expanding with live and functioning brain cells, the nerve tissue may be permanently stunted.

And this appears to be happening to Dr. Cravioto's malnourished children. Their bodies survived deprivation, but their brains in effect did not. Further studies have placed the phenomenon virtually beyond doubt. At Johns Hopkins, a group led by Dr. Bacon Chow subjected rats to fetal malnourishment; even though the babies were well fed after weaning, they turned out to be slow learners. At Cornell, Dr. Richard Barnes noted that early starvation of pigs caused long-term behavior damage.

A still more precise study of effects of nutrition on brain cell growth is under way at the Cornell Medical School laboratories, where Dr. Myron Winick uses a way of accurately counting brain cells by measuring the amount of nucleic acid in the whole brain. With this chemical yardstick, he has been able to determine that a rat brain achieves the bulk of its cells in the first 21 days of life. Now Winick and Chilean researchers are performing similar tests on the brains of children who died from malnutrition in Santiago, Chile. They have already determined that the bulk of cells in the human brain are grown in the first six months of life. Some post-mortems have revealed that undernourished children lack up to 20% of the brain cells normal for their age.

The broad implications of these findings are appalling for a generally hungry world. We must now accept the possibility that malnutrition can mean the mental degradation of whole societies, and that rehabilitation efforts may never make up for inadequate feeding during infancy. But not all the news in the field is grim. Researchers at Washington's Children's Hospital report that mongoloid children treated with certain amino acids walk and talk earlier than expected, which may mean that ways will be found to correct nutritional brain damage chemically. Dr. Bernard Rimland of San Diego's Child Behavior Research Institute goes further to suggest that nutritional improvements might someday help raise the average I.Q. level from 100 to 130. For research to proceed from warnings of disaster to a prescription for general betterment is a happy irony, but the disaster is much nearer at hand.

ALICIA HILLS MOORE.

THE TAX TREATMENT OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AND CORPORATIONS

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am once again introducing a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to clarify the tax status of professional corporations.

This matter has been the subject of bills introduced by myself and others in both the 89th and 90th Congresses. I would hope that the House Ways and Means Committee to whom this legislation will be referred will see fit to hold early hearings to resolve the issues raised by the bill.

Very simply stated, my bill would permit professional businesses to legitimately organize as associations and corporations under State laws with some assurance of continuity in Federal tax policy with respect to such organization. We are overdue in acting to guarantee this same right of organization to professional persons that we have always given other forms and types of businesses.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, the situation which prompts introduction of this bill is this:

First, Statute and legislative reference indicates that Congress has historically intended to classify business organizations according to local law for Federal income tax purposes, subject to necessary and logical Federal guidelines.

Second, Cases and regulations over the 50 years prior to 1960 tended to classify any professional business whose organization was in the doubtful category, as an association rather than a partnership. This classification system acquired the force of law.

Third, In 1960, the so-called Kintner regulations changed this longstanding classification system. Issued to clarify the status of professional corporations, they indicated the characteristics required, but primarily were keyed to local law. As a result, many States, Minnesota included, passed laws enabling incorporation under these regulations. Assuming the air was cleared, many corporations were formed. However, in 1965, the Internal Revenue Service issued new regulations reversing its position, which if upheld, make it almost impossible to create a professional corporation, regardless and in spite of State laws permitting the same.

No business can operate without some basis of continuity of the ground rules. If any set of rules should be stable, the rules governing the basic tax classification of businesses for tax purposes should be stable and not subject to administrative whim. Businesses, almost without exception—except for the professions with which this bill deals—are now allowed to decide whether to adopt the partnership, association, or corporate form under applicable State laws. There is no logical reason for denying this choice to persons who are rendering personal services in the medical or legal fields. Fairness and equity in application of the Federal income tax laws demands that all businesses be treated alike in this sense.

The only apparent reason for the 1965 amendments to the regulations was to prevent a possible reduction in Federal revenues. I am certainly convinced that this is not an adequate reason for ignoring years of legal precedent and congressional intent in this field. Furthermore, the providing of health, pension,

and profit-sharing plans through tax incentives under the corporate structure is a worthy objective and a legitimate use of the tax laws. Indeed, I am advised that any possible total tax revenue loss will be minimal when it is realized that most profits will be ultimately taxable, even though such taxation might be immediately deferred.

The position taken by the Internal Revenue Service in 1965 is untenable. It violates fairness, equity, reasonableness, years of legal precedent, and the intent of Congress as to the tax treatment of business organizations operating legitimately under State law. I would urge all my colleagues to support hearings and passage of this needed legislation at the earliest possible date.

This entire issue is given a quite exhaustive analysis in a fine article by Prof. Stephen B. Scallen, associate professor and assistant dean of the University of Minnesota Law School, in the March 1965 issue of the Minnesota Law Review. Mr. Speaker, I insert the summary and conclusions of Professor Scallen's study at this point in the RECORD, along with the text of my bill:

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The various versions of the statute and legislative history suggest Congress probably intended, in the beginning, to classify business organizations according to local law for federal income tax consequences. This classification was apparently to be made by local law label, so long as the label was not a sham. It was recognized that the difference in form of organization under local law could result in different consequences to businesses similar in all respects except for the formal structure under local law. It was recognized that personal service corporations were so like partnerships that, for a brief period, they were treated as partnerships for tax purposes; but it was decided to revert to taxing personal service corporations as corporations, according to the local law classification.

The courts, largely following the regulations, tended to classify borderline groups as associations. The courts looked to the agreement governing the relationship of the parties in finding characteristics which supported classification of these groups as associations. In all the medical cases litigated, the groups have been classified as associations. Clearly the professional would be classified under the cases as corporation and association corporation and professional association for federal income tax purposes.

For 50 years the regulations consistently tended to classify borderline cases as associations. At one point Congress reversed this tendency for certain groups strongly resembling partnerships. The regulations spoke of various factors as indicators of corporateness, and seemed to emphasize local law in discussing these indicators, although without explicitly rejecting the agreement of the parties as relevant. Under this long line of regulations, classification of professional associations and corporations would clearly be as corporations. This long-standing regulatory approach to the classification question was abruptly changed in the wake of the *Kintner* case by the publication of the *Kintner* Regulations which seemed to place ultimate reliance on the significance of local law in applying each criterion of corporateness, and which reject the use of the agreement between the parties as a source of corporate characteristics, although not as a source of diluting corporate characteristics. Nevertheless, classification of professional associations and corporations would probably

be as associations and corporations, rather than as partnerships, under these regulations, because these groups seem to have the required characteristics for corporateness. Finally, in the recent amendments to the *Kintner* Regulations, the Internal Revenue Service has pushed to an extreme and suggests that professional associations and corporations are partnerships, rather than associations and corporations, for federal tax purposes. Thus, the system is changed from the pre-*Kintner* regulations sweeping all doubtful cases into the association category, to a more neutral position in the *Kintner* Regulations based on heavy reliance on local law, and finally to the amended *Kintner* Regulations sweeping all "doubtful" cases (or at least professional associations and corporations) into the partnership category. These amendments grasp for any distinction between what they refer to as typical business corporations and professional groups. Then the thin distinction is magnified into a universal indication of the absence of corporateness. These amended regulations appear to use local law, professional ethics, and the agreement governing the relationship of the parties, wherever possible, to deny classification as association or corporation; but on the other hand, they ignore the agreements between the parties when they attempt to impute a corporate characteristic to the organization in its natural form under local law. When practicalities detract from corporateness, they are emphasized; when they tend to support the presence of a corporate characteristic, they are ignored.

Under these amendments, professional associations and corporations would probably be classified as partnerships. The *Kintner* Regulations and the amendments require better than two out of four of the corporate characteristics for classification as an association or corporation; the presence of only two out of four requires classification as a partnership.

The *Kintner* Regulations in some respects are inconsistent with the earlier regulations and with the cases; the amended regulations are almost wholly inconsistent with them. If the principles of the amendments were applied to the entire classification system, not just to professional groups, the result would probably be that no closely held, personal service organization could be a corporation for federal income tax purposes. Since that broad change of approach to the problem probably was not intended, the result appears to be a special set of rules—not entirely consistent with the general rules—for classification of professional groups. Why these groups require special, discriminatory-in-application, rules is not readily apparent.

All these systems of classification seem to apply, rather shallowly, certain differences between corporations and partnerships, without an examination of the relevance of the differences for federal income tax consequences. Where this application is a result of mere adoption of the local law classification, it is understandable as consistent with what was probably the legislative intent; but the relevance of the highly strained and extreme distinctions drawn under the amended *Kintner* Regulations is less evident. Where as the cases and the regulations appear to give more weight to, for instance, limited liability, the *Kintner* and amended *Kintner* Regulations weigh each "characteristic" the same, and omit certain characteristics which once were used to justify classification of groups as associations.

Of course, nothing in the statutes compels a court to take one view or the other on this classification question. With a wide possible range of interpretations of the statutory "definitions" that might be considered by a court, or by one who predicts what a court might do, or by one who suggests what a court should do, it is necessary to develop a

framework for deciding which classification system should be followed in these cases. The issue is: How should professional associations and corporations, as described earlier in this article, be classified for federal income tax purposes?

The case for classifying these groups as partnerships depends upon several contentions but primarily upon the alleged adverse revenue consequences. The revenue question, however, has several aspects. One aspect is the matter of whether less revenue will be collected as a result of classifying these groups as associations rather than as partnerships. The only self-evident truth is that the revenue considerations will vary in different circumstances. Less revenue will be collected when the recipient of deferred income paid from a pension or profit sharing plan (either the employee or his beneficiary) is in a lower marginal tax bracket; the same amount of revenue will be collected when the taxpayer is in the same marginal tax bracket at the time of receipt as the employee was in the year in which the benefit was earned; and more revenue will be collected when the recipient is in a higher tax bracket than was the employee when the benefit was earned. It is not readily evident which of these situations prevails overall. Some of the benefits are earned in years when the employee is in a low bracket. By retirement time his income from all sources may be much higher. Even if the income is earned at a time of fairly high personal service income, income from investments may become substantial in later years. Obviously, therefore, there will not be a revenue loss in all cases.

Furthermore, there will be an immediate, if temporary, increase in the tax paid by many professional groups changing from the partnership to the corporation form. If the partnership has been operating on a taxable year that is not a calendar year, income from the partnership has been reported for the calendar year during which the partnership year ends, thus causing a deferral of taxation of partnership income. When the group changes to the corporation form, the salaries paid to the doctor employees will be taxable in the year received, not later, and consequently there will be both acceleration and bunching of income, with considerably greater tax paid, and paid sooner, as a result.

At least it is apparent that in the arithmetic of national finance, the alleged adverse effect will not be great. After all the economy withstood a substantial tax cut without suffering. Furthermore, just one revenue ruling, such as the recent ruling on deductibility of treble damage judgments, may have revenue consequences of about the same magnitude.

Another aspect of revenue considerations is the deferral of recognition of income which will clearly result through the typical pension and profit sharing plan adopted by professional associations and corporations. The impact of this deferral is not likely to be great in any particular year, however, because the transition of these groups to association form, and then the implementation of full pension and profit sharing benefits are likely to consume many years. Also, a large number of professional groups, perhaps more than half, never will change. In any event the income will be reported sooner or later.

The relevance of either the assumed revenue loss or the effect of deferral of income to this classification problem is doubtful. They are not supposed to control the deciding of particular tax cases, and they should not be considered when there is as much history—legislative, judicial, and administrative—as in the instant case to provide the basis for decision. To change a long standing rule merely because the revenue considerations have changed does not seem to be a

proper use of the power to promulgate interpretive regulations.

Another reason advanced to justify the amended regulations is that doctor and lawyer groups have always been taxed as partnerships and, therefore, Congress intends to continue to tax them as partnerships. Besides the obvious non sequitur, the first difficulty with this argument is that some medical groups have long been operated in the form of associations. The prospect of the application of the amended regulations to those groups serves to put the consistency matter in issue rather clearly and to rebut the factual assertion. The second difficulty is that Congress has evidenced absolutely no intention to restrict these groups to one form or another for federal income tax purposes. The congressional form and intent never included, or froze into the tax law, state-created bars to the practice of professions in the corporate form.

It has been stated that although doctors and lawyers could change their forms of organization enough to be classified as corporations or associations, both the professional association discussed herein and some professional corporations have not changed enough. The regulations go far beyond this reasonable, if not persuasive, position. But a position on the classification issue depends on how one reads the authorities, and why. If you start with the Kintner Regulations as gospel, ignore the previous decades of cases and regulations, assume ultimate construction of these enabling statutes in the least helpful way, and then apply the Kintner Regulations in as hostile a manner as possible, you can logically defend the conclusion that these groups are not associations. Whether the doctors and lawyers have arranged for enough legislative change to enable these groups to achieve association or corporation classification for tax purposes, can also be answered either historically or in terms of the relevant policy considerations. Herein it is argued that history strongly supports the classification of these groups as associations, and that policy reasons require association classification where elected by the group through adopting the association or corporation form under local law. Why the answer should rather be found in a harsh reading of some regulations which are in many respects inconsistent with the cases and the long-standing regulations preceding is not clear.

Another reason given for denying the corporateness of some organizations is that the state laws have as their sole object the changing of the federal tax treatment of these groups. Presumably, such reasoning also asserts that something is sinister about that objective, and apparently assumes that compelling reasons are present for continuing the traditional classification of these particular groups for tax purposes. The last point is dealt with above. The sinister character of these acts is not apparent. These acts do not affect just federal taxation, but also affect local taxation, and presumably in the same way as the federal revenue is affected. The argument is that the federal courts should not recognize this blatant attempt to change the federal tax consequences to taxpayers by a mere change of state law.

Another way of looking at the matter is that Congress left the matter of form of business to the states, in spite of the resulting differences in taxation of otherwise identical businesses; the statutes enacted are well within the range of that delegation; the states have only acted to remove a traditional bar to doctors and lawyers using the corporate form; these statutes have substantial local law effects, on the same technical level as the admitted differences in corporations and partnerships; and these statutes do have local law tax consequences of the same qual-

ity as the federal tax consequences (and if harmful for federal purposes, harmful for state revenue purposes also).

Consequently, it might be argued, the more appropriate role for the federal courts is to recognize these state acts for federal income tax purposes, as Congress no doubt intended, and not to jump to the conclusion that something is sinister and wrong with the removal of a state created bar to practicing law and medicine in the corporate form. If federal tax consequences gave the final push to the state decision to change what were, at most, emotionally based prohibitions, so what? Federal tax consequences, and in some cases limited liability, are about the only substantial considerations in choosing the form for doing business, as a result of decades of lawyer ingenuity in removing the other differences. The states, not surprisingly, are finally recognizing this fact and allowing professional groups, as other businesses, to elect federal tax consequences by their choice of the local law form for doing business.

Presumably, the tax base is not significantly involved in this controversy since the income of the business, with quite minor exceptions, will be taxed eventually. Deferred compensation benefits under an employment contract, pension benefits, and profit sharing benefits all will eventually be included in someone's income. Although total exclusion from the tax base is allowed for qualified sick pay and for funds spent on such fringe benefits as group life insurance, these benefits are rather minor and are not important enough in revenue effect to be considered.

There seems to be a lack of discussion of the effect of the incorporation of these groups on the progressive character of our income tax, and the policies served by a progressive tax. Considering revenue considerations, the discussion set forth above applies. On the level of policies served by progression, it is difficult to see how those revenue considerations are so compelling, if of any merit at all, as to justify different treatment of two groups of "businessmen" in the business of rendering personal services, assuming both groups desire to be classified as associations or corporations. Furthermore, the tax system may be too progressive for personal service income, and yet too riddled with exceptions available to corporate executives and owners, but not to partners.

Finally, the attitude of the Internal Revenue Service might be attributed to a belief that the provisions of the Code on fringe benefits are too liberal, and also have been abused. If so, the remedy is not to deny these benefits to one group of businessmen, while allowing the other groups to retain those benefits. The answer is to attempt reform of the basic provisions applicable to all.

The case for classifying these groups as associations and corporations as intended by their owners, is simple enough. The classification for tax purposes was intended by Congress to be primarily a local law classification, even if subject to some federal limits. Since the cases and regulations for 50 years tended to classify doubtful groups as associations, that classification system acquired the force of law. The recent attempts to change the law by regulation should not receive favor by the courts. Furthermore, these professional businesses are entitled, so far as federal tax law is concerned, to choose whatever local law form the states will tolerate. Other businesses may decide whether to adopt the partnership form or the corporation form, and no good reason has been given to deny this choice to those who are in the business of rendering personal services in the medical or legal fields. Stated another way, there is no good reason for treating these businesses differently than other

businesses for federal income tax purposes. At stake is the basic element of fairness and equality that should be used in the application and administration of the federal tax laws. The change proposed by the amended Kintner Regulations is one—hazarding a prediction—that Congress would never adopt. Furthermore, for nontax reasons pensions and profit sharing plans are desirable and worthy of some tax benefits. These plans provide incentive for these employer-owners to fund their own retirement through such plans, rather than leave retirement funding to chance. Providing tax incentives to this worthy objective is a legitimate use of the tax laws.

The above analysis calls for a framework to allow these benefits to doctors and lawyers, if they are willing to adopt the appropriate business form, rather than a framework that seems to deny it. In coming to this conclusion no difficulty should be raised by the observation that many will not be able to obtain these benefits—for instance those employed by corporations who have no such plans or those not eligible for coverage under plans adopted. Some day that inequity may be rectified. Therefore, a framework should be adopted consistent with allowing these professional groups to organize under local law as associations and corporations. The framework could be that vague one developed under the cases and pre-Kintner regulations. Classification of these groups as associations and corporations would seem to follow easily.

On the technical level, the reenactment and long-standing rules do give considerable weight to the earlier approach leading to classification of groups as associations. There is no clear authority that the Commissioner can change interpretative rules that have survived many reenactments and that have received "the force of law" by courts adopting the criteria they provide.

But if the Commissioner should be able to change the approach taken in such regulations, the question remains: when, or in other words, for what reasons? Certainly there is merit in consistency in such regulations. Once a position is taken and widely adopted by the courts, it is best to continue the approach, because it is desirable for taxation rules to have good predictability of result, especially on the basic question of what form a business organization shall have for federal income tax consequences. If change occurs, a period of great turmoil results. Good reasons are needed to support such a change, and minor shifts in revenue advantage are not good enough reasons.

If changes are to be made, the Internal Revenue Service should be respectful of the authorities—legislative history and declarations, and the decided cases of the courts. Sometimes the regulations do have to be changed. The *Clifford* Regulations are an example. But they were bottomed on the *Clifford* case, and served the great need of providing detailed rules for predicting consequences of certain very common arrangements.

The Kintner Regulations, although representing some change of emphasis, do have some utility as a framework for deciding these cases by assuming a reasonable, not a strained and hostile, interpretation of those regulations. The technical, local law approach of those regulations has merit. The criteria of the cases and pre-Kintner regulations was not founded on practicality, and in that respect the Kintner Regulations are no worse. They do provide some ease of application, some predictability. Serious reservations remain concerning the weight of each of the Kintner Regulations criteria. Clearly, in the cases and the pre-Kintner regulations, not all these criteria are of equal importance. Yet the Kintner Regulations make them

equal. Clearly, limited liability is of greater importance and has greater weight than the other criteria; perhaps this importance could be reflected by giving that criterion double weight, if a fairly mechanical system must be used. Another advantage to using the Kintner criteria is that they were partly designed to settle the troublesome problem of classification faced by the oil and gas industry. It would not be desirable to unsettle that area by throwing out the Kintner criteria entirely, and it is not necessary to do so since medical and legal groups setting up to do business under the professional corporation and association acts could qualify under the Kintner Regulations, reasonably interpreted, as associations. While approving the Kintner Regulations might seem to be a slight compromise with the history of the pre-Kintner regulations and cases, it can be defended as a useful and fair compromise. More important, it can also be defended as a return to what Congress probably intended originally, to let local law determine the form of business and to let tax classification normally follow. The pre-Kintner regulations and the cases were not necessarily well balanced or justified in their tendency to classify all doubtful cases as associations.

The amendments to the Kintner Regulations, on the other hand, have no support historically, are not a balanced, fair approach to the problem, and discriminate against certain professional groups without justification. Consequently, a court need not follow such changes unless the Commissioner convinces it that compelling reasons of legislative policy justify the change, and that the court is a better forum for the legislative change than the legislature. That should be the burden of the Internal Revenue Service in these cases.

The Kintner Regulations, before amendment, are a good illustration of the proper exercise of the power to change interpretative regulations, if it exists, since they more faithfully interpret the original content of Congress, since they aid predictability, and since they have the practical value of avoiding excursions into a morass of facts.

H.R. 3564

A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following provisions of section 7701(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definitions) are amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (1) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) PERSON.—The term 'person' shall be construed to mean and include an individual, a trust, estate, partnership, or corporation."

(2) Paragraph (3) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) CORPORATION.—The term 'corporation' includes associations, joint-stock companies, and insurance companies. It also includes professional corporations and professional associations formed under the laws of any State, the District of Columbia, or any United States possession."

(3) Paragraph (7) is amended to read as follows:

"(7) STOCK.—The term 'stock' includes shares in any corporation."

(4) Paragraph (8) is amended to read as follows:

"(8) SHAREHOLDER.—The term 'shareholder' includes a member of any corporation."

Sec. 2. For taxable years beginning prior to January 1, 1965, the determination as to whether a professional association or professional corporation formed under State

law is to be treated as a corporation for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code shall be made as if this Act had not been enacted and without inferences drawn from the fact that this Act is not made applicable with respect to years before 1965.

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1964.

TRIBUTE TO DR. C. A. ROBINS

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, recently one of Idaho's most beloved citizens quietly observed his 84th birthday. Dr. C. A. Robins served as Governor of the State of Idaho from 1947 to 1951.

I first met Dr. Robins while serving as State president of the Future Farmers of America when it was my privilege to present to him the honorary State farmer degree in recognition of his outstanding leadership in improving and strengthening public education in Idaho.

Over the past three decades I have been deeply in Dr. Robins' debt for his friendship, for his wise counsel, and for his encouragement to me to pursue a career in public service.

Dr. Robins' public service and private life have been characterized by a deep love and understanding of his fellow man, a compassion for the underdog and a faith in the future. Idaho has produced many great public figures but none for whom the people have greater affection than this kind, gentle, and soft spoken physician.

I include as part of my remarks a recent article by Robert E. Smylie, former Governor of Idaho, published in the Idaho Observer paying tribute to Dr. Robins:

THE MAN WHO LED IDAHO INTO MODERN STATEHOOD

(By Robert E. Smylie)

Sometime in December Governor C. A. Robins had a birthday. He was 84, and I presume, as was his right, that he passed the day in quiet contemplation. The *Lewiston Morning Tribune* published a notable interview with him, but as far as I know the date was otherwise unmarked.

It would be natural that I should hold the good, grey doctor in affectionate and honored esteem. He set my course toward public service, and opportunities unlimited for an exciting and rewarding life. Even so, I would have passed his anniversary unnoticed but for the story in the *Tribune*.

C. A. Robins was our first four-year Governor and the first to come to power after the years of World War II. His years in the Governorship (1947-1951) really mark Idaho's transition from colonial status to modern statehood. It was not all accomplished in his time, nor is the work yet done, but the foundations were put in place in those years, and the spirit and the manpower were gathered under his guidance that have made much that has happened since seem almost inevitable in retrospect.

The Governor was first of all a physician. If you were close to him in the years of his incumbency you could detect this in many

ways. He was careful and cautious in prescribing remedies, yet bold and decisive when the decision was made to act. He was a kind man, gentle, soft-spoken and slow to anger.

I remember finding in the drawer of that big desk in the corner office of the Statehouse what must have been the notes to one of his speeches on the state of the State. It was written in ink on smallish paper in his careful and very readable script, much as a Doctor might have prepared a prescription. I recognized what I had found, for I heard it spoken and the handwritten text checked very closely with the Senate Journal for the day that the message was received.

Governor Robins' most massive accomplishment in the Statehouse was the reorganization of Idaho's Public School District System. The enactment and implementation of that program has to be one of the quietest revolutions in history. It was not less than that. The number of school districts was reduced from upwards of 1,200 to not more than 125. School administration laws were enacted that have provided the foundation for most of the progress in that field that has occurred since.

His administration also witnessed the commencement of our efforts in highway department reorganization. These in the fullness of time resulted in the superb organization that now administers our widening highway construction and maintenance program.

The Southern Branch became Idaho State College in those years, and commenced its march toward full University status. This achievement was uniquely Governor Robins' personal accomplishment. He was the first North Idaho Governor and could assuage like none of the rest of us could the fears of the friends of the University of Idaho. A bill which in any other session would have produced fratricidal conflict of massive proportion was skillfully and peacefully guided to unanimous passage. The floor leader who managed the bill in the Senate was the Senator from Latah County.

The Robins' administration also marked the commencement of modernization of the State's efforts in conservation of our endowment resources. This slow and still unfinished work of preserving our forests, our fish and wildlife, our park areas and our rangelands also traces its modern history back to the Robins' years. On his accomplishments in these fields we have built one of the finest wildlife conservation agencies in the West, and have finally achieved a State Department of Parks that promises soon to equal the accomplishments of its older brother in conservation.

The beginnings of Idaho's modern state library and museum also are marked in the years between 1947-1951. Those commencements were modest indeed, but the splendid building that will soon grace the Capitol Mall as a permanent home for the Library will be in part at least, a memorial in spirit to those venturesome years.

Doctor Robins' inauguration marked the commencement of the now quarter century long Republican incumbency in the Statehouse. It marked the end of what had been a decade of biennial changes in command. He came later to the Governorship than most, and his wisdom was mellowed with the experience of years, and long and consequential legislative service. It was one of the myths of that time that he really never wanted to be Governor. I do not believe it. He had some onerous and disappointing experiences, but on balance I think he rather liked making things happen. He was modest and unassuming; perhaps more so than the governorship of any state really permits, but his friends were people who would go to the well for him, together or all alone. He was not elected to the Senate when his term as Governor ended, but there are many who

thought then that he should have been, and they still think so.

The Robins' years left Idaho an important legacy of talent. For one reason or another he attracted young people to public service like no other man of his time. The accomplishments of Louise Shaddock, who was his secretary, have become almost a legend in her own time. Edward Woosley came from Oneida County to be Robins' State Land Commissioner. He went on to hold near cabinet rank in the Department of the Interior. Clay Spear was a trusted political lieutenant who became District Judge and is now a Justice of the Supreme Court of Idaho. Perry Swisher, who was one of his youngest and strongest adherents, developed into the most effective legislator in Idaho's modern history. Scattered all through the state government are people like George Denney who came to the state service as youngsters in the Robins' years and stayed for years of distinguished service to the State.

The good doctor also had the wisdom to not always prefer the young simply because they were young. Some of us were disappointed when he sent "old" Henry Dworshak back to the Senate, but the Governor was right. Dworshak ended his years in the Senate after more than a decade as probably the most effective Senator in all of Idaho's history.

It would be fair to say that in the case of Governor Robins, I am a biased observer. He put my own feet upon the rainbow. Nonetheless it is a fair statement that his incumbency as Governor of the State of Idaho marks the time of the State's transition from awkward adolescence, into the first stirrings of vigorous maturity.

In retrospect it somehow seems fitting that for those years we chose a physician to be Governor, and to guide us.

We chose well and it is a pleasure to remember that we did.

MUNKÁCSY: A GREAT HUNGARIAN PAINTER

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with several of my colleagues in commemorating the 125th anniversary of the birth of the internationally renowned Hungarian painter, Michael de Munkácsy.

Munkácsy experienced firsthand the sufferings of the Hungarian people in his childhood. His father died in an Austrian prison following the defeat of the Hungarian fight for freedom in 1848-49. That struggle was finally crushed by the armies of Russia, just as the 1956 attempt to restore Hungary's freedom was met with Russian tanks and infantry divisions.

In his youth, Munkácsy was sent to work as a carpenter's apprentice by his foster parents. His talents were, however, soon recognized and a scholarship enabled him to travel to Budapest for further study. A prize awarded for one of his paintings allowed him to continue his studies at the Art Academy of Düsseldorf, Germany. Here he made the ac-

quaintance of the American artist, John R. Tait, and through him received a commission from the American philanthropist J. Wiltach, of Philadelphia.

Wiltach's commission enabled him to paint his first world-renowned canvas: "The Last Day of a Man Condemned to Death." The painting received the coveted prize of the Paris Salon in 1870, establishing Munkácsy's European reputation. In Paris, he devoted himself to canvases of Biblical themes, but with a modern style and message. The best known ones are "Christ Before Pilate" and "Christ on Calvary," both purchased by John Wanamaker, of Philadelphia. They are regularly exhibited in the Grand Court of the Wanamaker store in Philadelphia to this day during Holy Week.

The two paintings were also exhibited on tours in Europe and the Eastern States of the United States and produced great enthusiasm and religious fervor among the audiences. Munkácsy visited the United States in 1886, staying in New York, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C. He was proclaimed as one of the great masters of the 19th century. A contemporary pamphlet by the editor of the National Academy Notes, Charles M. Kurtz, attests that during its European tours between 1881 and 1886, more than 2 million people saw the two paintings in Europe alone. In the United States, in less than 5 months, 150,000 people saw them before John Wanamaker had purchased them for \$150,000 and 500,000 francs, respectively.

Munkácsy, in his paintings, was seeking to express the nobility and dignity of the human race. His subjects are often contemporary, he even depicted strikers and workers, but in expressing their degradation his characters are always possessed of a certain hope and nobility of spirit. A realist, he still knew that the best instincts of man must be portrayed in order to preserve what is good and beautiful in mankind.

Munkácsy is another example of what a free Hungary gave to the world. This is not possible under Communist oppression.

FARMING SHOULD BE LIMITED TO FARMERS—TAX LEGISLATION TO BENEFIT THE FAMILY FARMER

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to limit the amount of farming losses which nonfarmers may use as an offset against their nonfarm income. A 2-year study by the Treasury Department, which was released on February 5, establishes the fact that these taxpayers are more interested in farming the Internal Revenue Code than they are in farming the land.

Briefly, the bill permits farm losses to be offset in full against nonfarm income up to \$15,000 for those whose nonfarm

income does not exceed that amount. For those with nonfarm income in excess of \$15,000 the amount against which farm losses may be offset is reduced dollar for dollar for income above \$15,000. For a number of years now there has been grave concern about the tremendous tax benefits enjoyed by wealthy individual investors and multiple-purpose corporations who acquire farms simply as a means of incurring losses with consequent income tax savings on an annual basis coupled with eventual capital gains treatment when the agricultural asset is finally sold.

According to Treasury's study these tax losses arise from deductions taken because of capital costs or inventory costs and thus represent an investment in farm assets rather than funds actually lost. When these tax losses, which are not true economic losses, are deducted from high bracket nonfarm income the result is a large tax savings on income that would otherwise be taxed at ordinary income tax rates.

According to some Treasury officials, the attractive tax benefits to wealthy persons have enabled them to bid up prices of farmland, thus forcing upon the ordinary farmer a detrimental competition on farmland purchases. Further, special farm accounting rules which were developed by the Treasury Department to ease the bookkeeping chores for ordinary farmers are the vehicles now used by nonfarmers to make the life of the true farmer more difficult. The true farmer must now compete in the marketplace with wealthy taxpayers whose interest in a fair profit in their farming activities is guided not by their needs but by their nonfarm tax bracket.

Legislation similar to this was introduced in the Senate in the 90th Congress and reintroduced as S. 500 in this Congress. Last year both the Departments of Agriculture and Treasury endorsed the bill as a means of not only closing the tax loophole but securing social and economic justice for people who are sincerely interested in making a living from farming.

An identical measure has been included as part of the extensive and noteworthy tax reform legislation introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS). Title XII of his bill and S. 500 are both identical to the bill I have introduced today.

The Dallas Morning News on November 20, 1968, published an excellent article by Walter B. Moore, editor of the Texas Almanac, entitled "Farming the Tax Law: Rich Makes Money by Losing It."

Mr. Speaker, I include the article in the RECORD.

The Committee on Ways and Means is urged to give this bill its earliest possible consideration.

The article follows:

FARMING THE TAX LAW: RICH MAKE MONEY BY LOSING IT

(By Walter B. Moore)

Wealthy Americans are making money farming or ranching while losing it. They do this through provisions of present income tax laws. It's entirely legal. But the Treasury

Department, Department of Agriculture, many members of Congress and others think laws should be changed.

Here's an example of how the law benefits those in the maximum income tax bracket. It's cited by the Treasury Department in a report in the Congressional Record of last Sept. 19.

The well-to-do investor whose main source of income is something else buys a cattle breeding herd. He chooses not to capitalize his cost of raising the cattle, amounting to \$200,000, and not to use an inventory method of accounting.

His \$200,000 expenses are deducted from his other income, saving \$140,000 in income taxes. Then, when his cattle are sold, he pays the 25 percent capital gains tax. On the \$200,000 portion, this totals \$50,000 which is \$90,000 less than the \$140,000 he would have had to pay.

Citrus orchards offer similar tax-saving opportunities. Many urban businessmen have found it profitable to have income tax savings from ranching and farming, even though they aren't in quite as high a tax bracket.

Those who have to depend on farming or ranching for all or most of their living say this is hurting them. They say that movie stars and many other wealthy persons don't even have to see their cattle or citrus; they hire firms that specialize in managing the whole deal.

Last year Black Watch Farms, which helps clients raise cattle, reported profits exceeding \$5 million on \$15 million gross revenues. Harold L. Oppenheimer of Kansas City has written books, "Cowboy Arithmetic," and "Cowboy Economics," dealing with the topic. He coauthored "Cowboy Litigation" on tax and legal aspects of ranching.

Treasury officials have said "the attractive tax benefits to wealthy persons have enabled them to bid up prices of farm land beyond those which would prevail in a normal farm economy . . . the ordinary farmer must compete in the marketplace with these wealthy farm owners who may consider a farm profit—in the economic sense—unnecessary for their purposes."

Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman advocates changing the tax laws to eliminate farm tax havens for corporations or individuals that have major nonfarm sources of income.

Here in Texas, studies by Texas A&M economists indicate that the productive value of land for farming and ranching today has almost no relationship to current inflated prices.

One agricultural worker recently told me he knew of no place in Texas now where land can be bought at a price that will yield adequate returns from farming.

Another sold Brazos bottomlands and put his funds in higher-yielding investments. A Hill Country editor told me landowners in his country are selling out to San Antonio businessmen and putting the money in stocks and bonds.

I should emphasize that city businessmen who farm or ranch often help rural areas. Their spending for supplies, labor and equipment benefits small towns and the people who live there. They can afford to try new things and often contribute to progress.

Everyone I know associated with agriculture agrees that this trend is a mixed blessing as well as a problem. Almost everyone also thinks something should be done about the tax law.

When Congress convenes next year, it will be asked to revise the tax laws. This has been tried before, but nothing happened.

Leader in efforts to change the laws has been Sen. Lee Metcalf, D-Mont. He introduced bills, then revise them at the suggestion of the Treasury and USDA. At the recent session, these were SB 4059 and HR 19916, a companion bill in the House.

Basic provisions of the Metcalf proposals include these:

Nonfarm income up to \$15,000 could be completely offset by farming or ranching losses in paying income taxes. This should protect the person who is primarily a farmer or ranchman but has a part-time job or other supplemental income.

Each \$1 of nonfarm income between \$15,001 and \$30,000 would reduce the original tax deductions allowed by \$1. This means that those with over \$30,000 nonfarm income could not deduct losses from farming. (There are some exceptions for local taxes, etc.)

Advocates of these measures argue that they will not keep the city man from having a farm. They will merely prevent him from misusing tax provisions developed primarily to benefit the bona fide ranchman or farmer.

Some say, that many of the problems of surpluses and inflation that face agriculture today are rooted in this absentee ownership and tax-loss farming.

It has been said that this hurts Texas producers more than all of the imports of agricultural products from abroad and that producer groups should spend more time trying to change the tax laws than trying to hike import barriers.

Farmer's Union, the National Grange and American Farm Bureau Federation will support some such legislation in the future, probably Metcalf's proposals. But many agricultural organizations have members who benefit from the tax setup and will oppose proposed changes.

Remember, also, that Congress now is urban minded. Rep. Jamie Whitten, D-Miss., recently said that only 47 out of 435 House members now have as much as 20 per cent of their constituency primarily engaged in agriculture. It is hard to pass agricultural legislation under such conditions, especially tax law changes that are opposed by businessmen who benefit from the status quo.

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing legislation which I sponsored in the 90th Congress to increase the individual income tax exemption rate per dependent from \$600 to \$1,000 a year.

Over the past three decades, the cost of living in the United States has more than tripled. During this same period the personal exemption rate, originally designed to relate to the cost of living and the cost of raising a family, has been increased only once and then by only \$100. As a further proof of just how outdated the personal exemption rate has become, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reports that it now costs an average of over \$1,400 per year to raise a child to the age of 18. To then provide this same child with a college education now costs American parents approximately \$2,500 per academic year.

Needless to say, the hopelessly inadequate exemption rate most adversely affects the ordinary wage earner situated between poverty and wealth. It is to this group that former Secretary of the Treasury Joseph M. Barr referred when he said recently:

We face the possibility of a taxpayer revolt if we do not soon make major reforms. The revolt will come not from the poor, but from the tens of millions of middle class families and individuals with incomes of \$7,000 to \$20,000, who pay over half of our individual income taxes.

The Federal Government itself has consistently recognized the inadequate nature of the present individual exemption rate. For example, we now spend about \$2,300 a year to maintain one inmate in a Federal prison; and the Cuban refugee program assumes that a child needs \$1,200 a year for minimum upkeep, \$2,200 if the child is in school.

As for the revenue loss resulting from the enactment of this measure, it is by now evident to all concerned that plugging only a few of the many blatant loopholes written into our present tax laws would more than offset the cost of raising the exemption rate to the more realistic and equitable level of \$1,000 per year. For example, the elimination of the disgraceful oil depletion allowance alone, as my bill, H.R. 6517, proposes, would result in increased revenues of around \$2 billion a year to our National Treasury. Overall, many experts have estimated the total potential savings to our Nation through the elimination of all tax loopholes to be in the vicinity of \$50 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer in good conscience tolerate a tax system which provides a ridiculously low and inadequate \$600 individual exemption, while simultaneously permitting 155 Americans who earned over \$200,000, including 21 with incomes of more than \$1 million, to escape paying taxes altogether in 1967. I strongly urge the Committee on Ways and Means to give my measure to increase the individual exemption rate to \$1,000 full consideration in its hearings which began this week on tax reform. I believe the enactment of this measure, along with the passage of other worthwhile and long-overdue proposals for reform of our tax structure, will result in a more just and equitable system for all our citizens.

GLENDALE HONORS APOLLO

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the personal dignity, courage, and honor of the crew of the Apollo 8, along with the technical excellence and uniqueness of that flight, moved the Glendale, Ariz., Union High School Districts' Board of Education to name its new high school, the Apollo High School. Hopefully, its students will choose to emulate the characteristics and the excellence of the men and the expedition.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks a letter in this regard, addressed to Col. Frank Borman, Jr., Air Force Systems Command, Houston, Tex.:

FEBRUARY 4, 1969.

Col. FRANK BORMAN, Jr.,
Air Force Systems Command, Scientific and
Technical Liaison Office, NASA Manned
Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex.

DEAR COLONEL BORMAN: The Board of Education of the Glendale Union High School District No. 205, at their meeting January 6, 1969, named the sixth school in the district "Apollo" in honor and appreciation of the accomplishments of the participating astronauts.

"Apollo" High School is now on the drawing board of our architects, the site is owned by the district, and the taxpayers of the district have approved bonding for the school. Construction is expected to start in June of this year with anticipated completion for occupancy in September of 1970.

We wish to extend an invitation to you and the other members of the Apollo 8 crew to participate in the dedication ceremony in August or September of 1970, with the exact date to be established so it fits within your schedule.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. GRAYDON B. HALL,
President.

Rev. EVERETT B. LUTHER,
Clerk.

Dr. ARTHUR N. LINDBERG,
Member.

Dr. JOSEPH P. VOORHEES,
Member.

ARNOLD H. ROVEY,
Member.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest and this year approximately 400,000 school students throughout the United States participated therein. The theme of this year's contest was "Freedom's Challenge." The Oregon winner in the contest was Miss Teri Little, of McMinnville, Oreg., and I include herein her prize-winning speech:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Teri Little)

Hello, America. I guess it is about time we have a man to country talk. We've been drifting farther and farther apart, you and I. We've needed a talk for a long time. I think we both realize that. We're beginning to lose our understanding of each other and our love is wavering in that loss. To regain our understanding and to reinforce our love, we must talk to each other if we both would fulfill our destinies. Both of our destinies are wrapped up in freedom—and, America, that's what we have to talk about.

The freedom you have given me is more, much more than a gift. It is a challenge, it is an exciting challenge and I am ready to meet it. But, must it be accepted on your terms alone? You have given me the freedom to express myself openly. You have given me the freedom of speech and of the press. But does freedom of speech mean I can speak from my convictions? And freedom of the press—can I print my deepest concerns? I'm not sure anymore. America, is there a limit to freedom? And is that limit on the freedom

of speech that point at which I begin to say "no"? That point at which I march in a street with a printed sign or sit firmly outside the head office of Dow Chemical? America, does dissent frighten you? I believe it does. And because of that fear are you going to leave the word "No" out of the vocabulary encompassed by freedom? America, where does my freedom to dissent end? Or do I even have that freedom?

I think we're having a lovers quarrel, you and I. Caring for someone enough to come right out and tell them when something is wrong is an act of love. Wanting for someone what is best at any cost is also an act of love, and I love you, America. But at times I do not agree with some of the things you are doing. It is at these times I must come right out and express my feelings. It is at these times I take up the challenge of freedom, the challenge you yourself have given me—the freedom to be me. Why can't you listen to me? Your torch of freedom has shown bright over all the world. You have proclaimed your challenge to many nations. But will your ears be clear enough to hear my cries here at home? Will your eyes be open enough to see my tears and will your heart be sensitive enough to feel my longing for peace of mind? Please, leave yourself open to my words, the words I speak in reaction to your challenge of freedom. You speak for what you believe and you want everyone to listen. I speak for what I believe and all I ask is that you listen. Will you listen? Or once again will police dogs be set on me in Birmingham? Will you listen? Or once again will I be beaten to the streets of Chicago? Will you listen or once again will I die in vain in Viet Nam.

America, listen to your people's pleadings. For our understanding of each other is the only hope of bridging a glorious past to a free and challenging future!

GONZALEZ BILLS BENEFIT LOCAL AND FEDERAL FIREFIGHTERS

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation on behalf of some of the most faithful and most hard-working public servants in American society today—the firefighters.

Recognizing their contribution and at the same time recognizing the obvious and underlying hazards that face them daily, I am reintroducing a bill which would provide for the inclusion of Federal firefighters under the hazardous occupations retirement provisions of title 5, United States Code. The bill would thus provide Federal firefighting personnel the opportunity to retire at age 50 with minimum service of 20 years, with full annuities, providing the head of the agency so recommends that the Civil Service Commission approves. Federal law-enforcement officers are now covered under this provision, and so are the District of Columbia firemen.

Last fall I testified in behalf of the Senate-passed bill and my similar bill before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I cited figures of the high fatality rate among firemen. I cited figures that lost time due to injuries for firemen is higher than for any other profession. I argued

that these facts demonstrated the hazardousness of the duties of Federal firefighters, and that they should, in all justice, be included among the hazardous duty occupations of the Federal service.

The subcommittee voted to report this legislation favorably to the full committee. When a committee quorum could not be reached in the hectic press of adjournment business, the bill was brought to the floor of the House under unanimous consent rules. When an objection to this procedure was raised and sustained the bill was recommitted to committee and thus killed. I am optimistic that the Congress will quickly enact this legislation into law. Only in this manner can we show that we are not blind to the inequity that exists now.

My second bill, which I also sponsored in the last Congress, would improve the basic workweeks of firefighting personnel of executive agencies. Not only are firefighters not accorded the same benefits given another group for performing hazardous duties, but they are required to work a 72-hour week for 52 weeks a year, including holidays and Sundays. My bill stipulates that the basic workweek of each Federal firefighter not exceed 120 hours within each 2-year pay period, the hours of duty of each work shift being consecutive. For hours of duty in excess of the regular hours of duty—40 hours—the firefighter would be entitled to overtime, night, Sunday, and holiday pay rates.

Also during the last session, I thought perhaps the most comprehensive way to aid both local and Federal firefighters, as well as the general public, would be to establish a reputable body of research into fire prevention and control. We need to know more about effective measures for reducing the destructive effects of fire, throughout the country. We need to evaluate the present and future needs for trained, and educated firemen; we need to know whether the public's demand for competent firemen requires Federal grants for their education, or possibly a national policy of draft deferment for firemen, or both. Therefore, I introduced a joint resolution to establish a National Advisory Commission on Fire Prevention and Control.

I am very pleased indeed that this Commission was incorporated within Public Law 90-259, which Congress passed last March. Title II establishes the Commission. The Commission would be composed of the Secretaries of Commerce and Housing and Urban Development and 18 other members appointed by the President, plus four advisory members from Congress. The Commission is to report its findings in 2 years.

At long last, the morbid evidence of deaths, injuries, and property damage pressed the need for comprehensive research into this area. But fortunately, although the law was passed and the need was recognized, appropriations were not approved because of the cut-back in Federal expenditures. So now the law exists, but the Commission cannot be organized nor its studies begun. To rectify this, I am introducing a bill to appropriate \$665,000 for implementation

of this important Commission. The figure is the Department of Commerce's estimate of the total costs of the Commission. The rewards shall be greater than this sum.

Accordingly, I urge the Congress for favorable consideration of this appropriation bill and the two bills that benefit Federal firefighters.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, today the Nation is beset by discord; by those who would use its freedom to abolish that very freedom. But many Americans, indeed most Americans, have learned the hard and bitter lesson from men who struggled and died for freedom at Valley Forge, at Shiloh, at Chateau-Thierry, at Bastogne, at Chosin Reservoir, and who fight in the humid tropics of Vietnam even today.

The lesson is that freedom must be defended.

And the lesson of the rise of communism and fascism is that we must be ever vigilant to insure our precious freedom is not used by revolutionary radicals to destroy that freedom.

Those who would destroy our social fabric can afford to lose every struggle, every election, because freedom allows them to try again and again and again. But if freedom ever loses once, it could be lost forever.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars have been staunch defenders of the American ideal. And they have developed programs to broaden freedom's cause.

Mr. Speaker, I include the paper of Miss Debra D. George, a constituent in my district, the great State of Wyoming, and winner of the Department of Wyoming's Voice of Democracy contest, in the RECORD:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Debra George)

"I want!" they cried, and seventeen selfish students closed an entire college.

"I want!" they cried, and a hand full of loud-mouthed demonstrators forced a presidential candidate from the podium.

"I want!" they cried, and a gang of neighborhood ruffians conveniently had an excuse to break shop windows to fill their pockets, and to destroy four church buildings within a week.

"I want!" she cried, and a sixteen-year-old girl found herself too deeply involved in drugs, and felt suicide was the only answer.

Freedom—Each of these wanted freedom; not as it was offered, but selfishly and blindly. In trying to grasp such a shallow freedom, how much tighter did they secure the bonds of all Americans?

Freedom—How? For whom?

Is the businessman for whom it is no longer safe to walk home from work at night, free? Is the rabbi who is forced to put up barbed wire to protect his synagogue, free? Is the candidate for president who must compete against his audience to present his ideas, free?

I shudder to think that my brother, my fa-

ther, or my husband would fight with such determination to make a dream come true for their children and have it taken away by some self-centered radical who has yet anything to yell except "I want!"

And yet—freedom was a dream; a dream for which men fought and died. This dream became a blessing and was given to all Americans. Not just to an over-eager teenager, not just to an under-privileged street-walker, not just to a rebellious student, but to each and every American. And each and every American has this freedom to do with as he wishes, as long as he sees his neighbor as an American with rights, too.

Freedom is the right to find yourself as an individual. But does this necessitate the pollution of one's body and mind with deadly drugs?

Freedom is the right to speak, but why should this right belong only to a minority of the audience, and not to the man for whom the assembly was specifically called?

And—yes—every American, no matter who or what he is, has the right to freedom and opportunity. But if he feels cheated, from where does he get his right to loot or destroy another's property?

I, too, want freedom: The freedom for which my ancestors fought and died. But I realize that freedom, like all good things, has to be earned and protected. Such a prize, bombs, guns, and stones will not protect. It must be guarded with an ever alertness and awareness of our responsibilities as citizens of a great nation, and with a courtesy and a consideration of our neighbors as fellow citizens of these United States.

When we, as Americans, are ready and willing to accept these responsibilities and look upon our neighbors with the respect they deserve, then will our forefathers' dream be fulfilled—and truly we will have accepted Freedom's challenge!

VIET WOUNDS KILL JACK E. CAMPBELL

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. Jack E. Campbell, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend his bravery and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

VIET WOUNDS KILL JACK E. CAMPBELL—ELLCOTT CITY ARMY SPECIALIST WAS 19, JOINED LAST YEAR

Army Spec. 4 Jack E. Campbell, of Ellicott City, has been killed in hostile action in Vietnam, the Defense Department reported yesterday.

Specialist Campbell, 19, died last Saturday from wounds received in a firefight in Pleiku province, where he was serving as an infantryman in Company B, 1st Battalion, 35th Infantry, 4th Infantry Division.

He was first reported missing in action. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Campbell, of 704 Race road, Ellicott City, were told of his death Wednesday.

"He never wrote much about the place," his mother said yesterday, "but sometimes he mentioned how awful it was, how the people had to live and what they ate."

ENLISTED LAST FEBRUARY

In one letter, Mrs. Campbell said, her son wrote "how he had seen a little boy eating from a garbage can and he bought him a hamburger and stayed with him all day."

A graduate of Westchester Avenue Elementary School, Specialist Campbell attended

Catonsville Junior High School and worked in the mail room of the Ellicott City Times.

He enlisted in the Army last February and was sent to Vietnam in September.

In addition to his parents, his survivors include three brothers, Michael Campbell, Ronald Campbell, and Clyde Campbell, and two sisters, Brenda Campbell and Carolyn Campbell, all of Ellicott City.

NEED FOR BAIL REFORM

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the case for bail reforms is built on volume after volume of facts, many times tragic, over the years which, I feel, clearly reveal the deficiencies of present-day bail standards. The newspapers, in recent months, have helped to focus public attention on this issue, and, indeed, Congress seems in the mood to act, without fanfare, but in recognition of the need to promote the general welfare and safety of the public by making the release of criminal defendants on bail less of a formality.

Today, therefore, I am introducing a companion bill to those introduced by several other Members in both Houses that would authorize the conditional pretrial release or detention of certain persons who have been charged with non-capital offenses.

In my estimation, Mr. Speaker, the bill shows a great deal of restraint and can certainly not be attacked for being unreasonable. It is not a "lock the door and throw away the key" approach. It should be emphasized that the judicial officer has substantial leeway in imposing conditions of release to assure the appearance of a defendant as required and, likewise, to reasonably assure the defendant will not pose a danger to the community or to any person or property in the community. If in the latter case all lesser conditions are inadequate to the particular situation, in the discretion of the judicial officer, the defendant may be detained.

In addition, the mandatory penalty provisions, upon conviction, for willfully failing to appear or for committing any offense while released under the provisions of the act should certainly deter violations of the conditions under which a defendant is released.

Among the many news articles on this subject is one which contains the "testimony" of perhaps the most professional of the experts, because it is that of one defendant who has benefited many times over from the laxity of current bail standards. The article is reprinted at this point in its entirety for the interest of those who may still doubt the need for bail reform:

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Feb. 16, 1969]

ROBERT EARL BARNES URGES TOUGHER STANDARDS FOR BAIL

(By John Fialka)

Although a Senate subcommittee has received testimony from a number of impressive witnesses on ways to change the Bail

Reform Act, it has not heard from the man who considers himself the best ball risk "who ever lived to be at large on bail."

The man is Robert Earl Barnes, perhaps the most famous burglar in recent Washington history. In a recent letter to a U.S. District Court judge, Barnes called for more prompt trial dates and tougher bond standards.

"Once I reached the age of 17, I jumped on the ball bond wagon and have been on it ever since," Barnes wrote, giving examples of the revolving door pattern of arrest, bail and rearrest that has marked 20 years of his life.

Part of the "bondwagon" include Barnes' experiences in and around Washington in 1964 and 1965. He cites his own record, which includes a total of \$48,000 in bail bonds set by area judges and promptly posted by Barnes' bondsmen so that he remained free on all of the charges (most of them house-breaking) simultaneously:

Date and jurisdiction:	Bond
Apr. 10, 1964, Montgomery County--	\$6,000
Apr. 24, 1964, Washington-----	3,000
May 12, 1964, Washington-----	5,000
July 25, 1964, Washington-----	10,000
July 28, 1964, Washington-----	5,000
Sept. 4, 1964, Prince Georges-----	3,000
Sept. 12, 1964, Prince Georges-----	1,000
Oct. 12, 1964, Washington-----	5,000
Dec. 9, 1964, Prince Georges-----	10,000

This record is small, Barnes points out, compared to \$112,000 worth of bonds he made during a cycle of 10 burglary arrests in St. Louis, Mo., between February and June 1961.

Barnes charges that the current bail law is "ridiculous" because he observed it perfectly, never forfeiting a bond because of a missed court appearance. Yet, he admits, his criminal record while out on bail was "devastating."

He noted that his career in burglary was somewhat slowed after the first arrest in a cycle because he had to take time out for frequent court appearances for various stages of his cases.

"I was making so many court appearances that the courthouse staff began to think I was an attorney," Barnes said.

Although Barnes' only legal background has been gained in trying to unravel his incredibly complicated court record, his proposals on the subject of bail reform are similar in many respects to those of the legal experts who appeared recently before Sen. Sam J. Ervin's subcommittee.

He urges accelerated trials for all defendants charged with a crime of violence. Further bonds should be denied to anyone who is charged with a crime while free on bond, he states.

Barnes asserts that heroin addicts should be made to submit to a weekly test while on bond to see if they have returned to the use of drugs.

The Ball Reform Act of 1966 is irrelevant to the criminal repeater, Barnes charges. The law allows release on personal (non-money) bond to persons with good community ties.

"Few individuals with criminal records depend on the courts to release them on personal bonds. They depend on the professional bondsmen. They are often released by the bondsmen on a promise of money, and have to return to an act of crime in order to pay the bond fees to remain on the streets," he adds.

Barnes called for an end to the system of professional bondsmen and said this would help reduce the city's crime rate.

"Often before he commits any crime, he (the criminal) will employ the bondsman to take him out if he is apprehended. You take this precious bond, this precious key away from the bondsman and the criminal will find himself in trouble."

The professional burglar said he agrees with the conclusions of judges, attorneys and

other witnesses who appeared before the Ervin subcommittee that unless there are enough D.C. Bail Agency workers to supervise those out on bail, any restrictions imposed upon them by judges are meaningless.

He disagrees strongly, however, with attorneys and some newspaper columnists who have taken the position that the Constitution guarantees the right to bail, a position that the Supreme Court has never clearly ruled upon.

Noting that the only reference to bail in the document is the Eighth Amendment's statement that "excessive bail shall not be required" in cases where bail was allowed, Barnes gives his opinion.

"Remember, the right to bail is a right, like Hell. There is no such thing."

Barnes was recently paroled by Maryland to the District, where he will begin to serve 4 sentences of 5 to 15 years each, to run consecutively.

He confessed to heading a housebreaking ring in the city in 1964 and 1965 and later gave testimony that led to the conviction of three Metropolitan policemen and six civilians in connection with the ring.

DR. ROBERT GOLDSTEIN

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Robert Goldstein, son of Mr. and Mrs. Sam Goldstein, of South Ozone Park, N.Y., is now a prominent engineer—a supervisor of the antiballistic missile department of the Aero Jet Co. in California.

Bob's family, my constituents and neighbors, are quite proud of their son, and rightly so.

In 1959, Robert Goldstein addressed the Joint Industry Board scholarship breakfast to thank the board for his scholarship award and to give his views on the importance of a broad, liberal education.

After his student days at Columbia, including an exchange tour in Norway, Bob received his master's degree and his doctorate in physics and science at the California Institute of Technology. During his studies, Bob received four fellowships, one scholarship, and then eight assistantships. He spent 6 years in space technology research and now has assumed the important responsibility of engineer supervisor at Aero Jet's IBM department.

Mr. Speaker, often statements made in the past are quite timely when read in the light of present situations.

For that reason, I insert in the RECORD the text of Dr. Robert Goldstein's address to the Joint Industry Board scholarship breakfast on May 16, 1959:

ADDRESS BY ROBERT GOLDSTEIN

Mr. Chairman, for fifteen minutes I have been sitting here, wondering, trying to figure out what I have in common with 1,400 people and it finally came to me. We are all sitting here, wondering how we got here, how we were able to get here at 8 o'clock in the morning. I may not know what or how I got here but I do know why I am here. It is a rare opportunity when one gets a chance to say thank you to such a large group to whom he feels great gratitude, especially years after receiving an award and having time to realize

its full worth. I know I am also speaking for every recipient of the Joint Industry Board scholarship the past twelve years, in expressing my thanks to the Union officials, the electrical contractors and the Joint Industry Board. You've given us a fantastic opportunity. In talking about this scholarship, there is one point I want to impress upon you and now I am speaking directly to these young people sitting before me who didn't win today.

It is very nice to have won a scholarship but the most important thing is to further your education, whether this be with or without aid. Of course, the scholarship made getting this education much easier for me but the value of an education doesn't change with the ease or difficulty in obtaining it and sometimes when it doesn't come so easy, the student is able to realize the full worth of education to a greater extent. I can't impress this upon you enough. Mainly, that you must continue your education. There are a few other points I'd like to make and I'd like to use personal experience to illustrate them. Education can be a funny thing. Because of a technicality, five years ago this was, I was not eligible for the Joint Industry Board scholarship when I graduated from high school and I went to a four year engineering school, a very good school, my freshman year and I won this award at the end of this freshman year. This introduced a problem to me. I—well sort of—I was very well set in this old school. I had received very good marks. I had made an awful lot of close friends. I had joined a fraternity and I was very well set into the routine and I enjoyed it and I just didn't know whether or not to accept the award and transfer schools. The primary factor in my finally deciding to go to Columbia was—and this may sound very funny—that I felt ignorant. Ignorant in most things besides engineering, science and math. I felt my education had been geared too narrowly. I needed, well, broader interests and I felt Columbia would help me get this. I think I was right. Not that I am all knowing in all fields now but I have at least been exposed to many of the things that can be listed under the general heading of a liberal education and I have been made to realize that these things have great value and that they can be very enjoyable. Music, art, philosophy, psychology—all have something to offer the person who is willing to take the effort to introduce himself to them. The person who specializes in one field and only one field loses so much of life. By acquiring wide interests and this doesn't have to be done only under the scope of education or under college or a school, this person adds much to his enjoyment of life. Again I am going to repeat, this applies not only to students but to everyone, being an electrician, an electrical contractor, a housewife or even a college professor. Find out about other things in life. You may enjoy them.

The last point I'd like to make I am directing to those students behind me who have just won scholarships. As I mentioned before, I had done very well in my freshman year and so when I came to this scholarship breakfast four years ago, I actually expected to win and I did. In fact, most of my life, I have had extreme confidence in myself when it came to academics and schooling, even to the point of being cocky but life can play funny tricks. Last term I applied for a National Science Foundation Fellowship to MIT and a few months ago, I received their answer. It said simply, although they sent my name to the National Committee, I had been turned down. I stared at this letter and gradually the idea sunk in. I had been refused, turned down. I had lost. Somehow I began to realize my foolish attitude. I felt I had to impress it into my mind as a lesson to myself. I hung that letter right above my desk where every time I start working it is able to remind me that

I am not infallible. I can be turned down and that if you want to get something, you have to continue working for it and not live on laurels. If I get this one point across to you, I will be satisfied. Confidence is great to have but watch when this "I am great" attitude starts sneaking up on you. It can be very deceiving and destroying. Winning a scholarship is a great honor and you probably earned it but don't stop there. If you want to go further, you've got to keep earning it. Let the scholarship be a beginning and an incentive for you.

KATZENBACH'S MANSION DEAL— FOR NAUGHT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the recent \$125,000 profit Nicholas Katzenbach made on the sale of his "white elephant" manor to be a benefactor of his former administration days was all for naught.

You see, this "made over" Republican is being retained as an "adviser" by the new President. He could have kept his house—did he not know there was not a dime's worth of difference?

Mr. Speaker, I submit a report from the Chicago Tribune of December 18, 1968, and portions of Paul Scott's report of January 24, 1969, for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Dec. 16, 1968]
KATZENBACH MAY FACE PROBE IN SALE, U.S.
LOAN

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, December 15.—Two congressional watchdogs of public funds have been asked to look into the \$180,000 sale of a remodeled \$55,000 house by Undersecretary of State Nicholas Katzenbach.

The high state official sold his house last month to Timothy B. Atkinson, general counsel of the Asian Development bank. Katzenbach helped the bank to get 200 million dollars from Congress.

The house is a sprawling Victorian frame structure, built at the turn of the century, with wide porches and ornamented gables, which had been considered a white elephant. The Katzenbachs added a large living room and a swimming pool.

Sen. John J. Williams [R., Del.], the one time feed and grain merchant, and Rep. H. R. Gross [R., Ia.], the former newspaper and radio reporter, are interested in knowing whether the sale had any relation to the appropriation for the development bank. The two members of Congress are widely known for their singlehanded battles to save tax dollars.

On Oct. 2, 1967, Katzenbach, as acting secretary of state, sent a letter to the Senate foreign relations committee urging the passage of the appropriation for the bank. The letter was addressed to Chairman J. W. Fulbright [D., Ark.].

PATH TO AN EARLY IMPROVEMENT

"Lasting peace in east and southeast Asia depends upon the belief of the peoples of this region that there is a practical and peaceful path to an early improvement of their social and economic status," he said. "Only this belief can eliminate the tempting alternative presented by the false promise of quick and violent solutions to deep-seated problems."

CXV—262—Part 3

Katzenbach urged the passage of the appropriation as representing "a sound and conservative investment in the future peace of this troubled area of the world." He offered to furnish additional testimony for the bill if the committee desired.

Curiously enough on Feb. 27 of this year, five months after Katzenbach submitted his letter to Sen. Fulbright, Rep. Wright Patman [D., Tex.], chairman of the House banking and currency committee, received the same letter—word for word—over the signature of Secretary of State Dean Rusk in support of the appropriation. It is not clear whether Katzenbach wrote the original letter or whether it was prepared for him in the department.

Last May 9 Katzenbach appeared before the House banking and currency committee to urge passage of the related 480 million dollar appropriation for the International Development bank. He asked for 160 million in the current year. He said that delay in the appropriation might "seriously interrupt the flow of development resources to many countries."

DEPRIVED OF RESOURCES TO HELP

"Development—as we have learned to our sorrow—is not only a foreign problem," Katzenbach said. "We have seen in our own country what can happen when people are forgotten and deprived of the resources to help themselves. The politics of despair are no different abroad than they are at home. But the results of continued neglect may be even more explosive than what we have ourselves thus far experienced."

The Katzenbach sale has upset the real estate market in Washington's Cleveland Park area. Prices may never be the same, especially at 3141 Highland place, N.W., where the Katzenbachs entertained Princess Margaret on her visit to Washington in 1965.

Katzenbach sold in advance of his impending departure, forced by the Republican victory in November's election. He was one of the first leading Democrats to sell his home here. His sale has upped the asking prices of other Democrats being forced into retirement.

Walt W. Rostow, the special White House assistant on foreign affairs, has put his Cleveland Park home on the market. He is reported to have paid \$75,000 for the home in 1962 and is now asking \$150,000 plus the agent's fee.

THE SCOTT REPORT

WASHINGTON, January 24, 1969.—For one pledged to carry out a thorough housecleaning of the State Department, President Nixon appears to be going at it in a very strange way.

As a starter, the President has retained as foreign policy consultants several of the Johnson and Kennedy Administrations' most controversial advisers in a bid for unity.

Most prominent of those being kept on as consultants to the State Department and White House are George Ball, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, and Nicholas DeB. Katzenbach, former Under Secretary of State and Attorney General.

Katzenbach's retainment as a State Department Security consultant is also being taken by GOP members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as another sign there will be no general housecleaning.

During the closing days of the Johnson Administration, Katzenbach sent a memorandum to several government agencies saying that the issuance of a security clearance to former State Department aide John Paton Davies, Jr., "would be clearly consistent with the interests of national security."

The Davies case.—John Foster Dulles, President Eisenhower's Secretary of State, announced on November 5, 1954, that Davies

was being dismissed "on the grounds of lack of judgment, discretion, and reliability."

Davies, most of whose 23 years of service had been in the Orient, was one of the China hands in the State Department who were charged by Senator Joseph McCarthy and others with having undermined American policy toward China and contributed to the Communist victory there in the late nineteen-forties.

Katzenbach's memorandum clears the way for Davies to be appointed as a consultant to the State Department and the Arms Control Disarmament Agency on U.S. policies toward Communist China.

Requests of Congressional backers of Otepka to Katzenbach to intercede for the veteran Security officer were denied. Katzenbach indicated his support of Otepka's removal.

Other controversial Johnson Administration officials tapped by Nixon to stay on are Helmut Sonnenfeldt, Director of the State Department's research office on Soviet Union affairs, and Ambassador Harlan Cleveland, U.S. Representative to NATO.

A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced with 42 cosponsors a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act to provide for the establishment of reduced air fares for senior citizens, young adults, and military personnel.

The recent, adverse ruling by an examiner for the Civil Aeronautics Board—CAB—makes it imperative that prompt legislative steps be taken to continue the special, low air fares for young people and to provide for similar reduced fares for senior citizens, aged 65 or older.

A CAB examiner ruled on January 21 that the special youth fares were unjustly discriminatory and should be canceled. This ruling is now being reviewed by the CAB. Should the Board affirm the examiner's findings, existing youth fares would be abolished.

My proposal would specifically authorize the CAB to permit reduced air fares for senior citizens, students, and military personnel on a space-available basis. With the passage of this bill there will no longer be any doubt about the legality of standby fares.

Under the measure, senior citizens are defined as individuals aged 65 or older, youths as individuals over the age of 12 and under the age of 22, and military personnel as members of the U.S. armed services traveling at their own expense, in uniform of those services, while on official leave, furlough or pass.

One of the most common complaints I hear in conversations with older people is about the problem of loneliness caused, in part, by being cut off from family and friends by the high cost of transportation to other parts of the country.

Too many of our old people are caught in a cruel paradox. They have more time than any other groups to visit friends and relatives and yet, because of high

travel costs and fixed low incomes, they are often unable to make these visits. As with our youth, the special reduced air fares will help to alleviate this plight of our senior citizens.

Joining me as cosponsors of the bill are: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CULVER, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WRIGHT.

A BILL TO AMEND THE OIL POLLUTION ACT OF 1924

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, over the years, my position on water pollution has become well known. In introducing my bill today to amend the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, and authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the possibility of establishing marine sanctuaries, I simply want to put into the Record remarks which I offered in hearings before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in April 1968. My remarks are even more pertinent today than they were last year. If you, Mr. Speaker, or any of my colleagues have questions, I would be delighted to answer them.

The remarks follow:

STATEMENT OF HON. HASTINGS KEITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Chairman, I would like to state the problem which we are here to consider today by quoting the recent Report of the President on Marine Resources and Engineering Development. Under the heading "Rational Uses of the Coastal Zone"—meaning the nation's shore areas and coastal waters—the President's Report says the following:

"This area of inshore waters is ecologically fragile and complex in its natural state. It is nevertheless subject to ever more intense pressures for varied uses which may both conflict among themselves and degrade the natural environment * * * .

"Only rarely have lands and waters of the Coastal Zone been subjected to planned and controlled development. Further, the planning which has been done has not always resulted in effective allocation of resource uses among competitors.

"As a consequence, the trend in some places has been toward single-purpose uses, determined by immediate economic advantages to individuals, firms, and local governments."

What the bill before us intends to do, Mr. Chairman, is fully in line with these observations. It seeks to encourage balanced, compatible uses of our offshore waters—first, by identifying alternative uses, and then by ensuring compatibility among these competing values and resources.

The need for this effort, Mr. Chairman, is made clear by recent developments on both the East and West coasts of the United States. Several major oil companies have, in the expectation of finding petroleum deposits below the continental shelf, been investigating the sea bottom off the coast of Massachusetts and New England. They will soon enter their 3d season of exploratory testing, which will run from May to September, and which will include the highly valuable fishing grounds of the Georges Bank.

For the present, in this stage of exploration and testing, conflicts have been avoided by the cooperation of all the parties involved. The Geological Survey office of the Interior Department, which has authority to issue permits for exploration activity, now consults and cooperates with the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to ensure that approved operations will not result in harm to fish resources. Fishing representatives are consulting continuously with oil representatives in the Boston area, and both are consulting with the Interior Department.

But we must be concerned with the future, when the most serious conflicts are likely to arise. What will happen when the oil companies request leases from the Interior Department to begin drilling operations? Will they be allowed to drill in the most productive fishing areas? Or are certain well-tailored restrictions necessary to ensure that oil rigs and pipelines and allied operations do not harm or interfere with commercial fishing?

These are the kinds of questions which the present legislation is designed to answer. The study called for in the bill would determine the likely impact of new industrial activities on the other natural resources and values of certain marine environments. It would determine whether some kind of "ocean zoning" is necessary to make these various uses compatible, and whether certain portions of our offshore environments should be sanctuary areas, closed to new industrial activities.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that there are certain drafting weaknesses in it, and I hope that the observations of the witnesses in these hearings will help us clear them up. Firstly, "marine sanctuaries" is not fully defined. Let me spell out very clearly, then, what the Secretary of Interior could consider as a marine sanctuary.

A marine sanctuary area would be an ocean area which is especially distinctive for its commercial fishing uses, and for its scenic, recreation, and wildlife conservation values. In such an area, the Secretary of Interior would be authorized to restrict, prohibit, or prescribe the conditions under which industrial activities could be carried on, including the mining of gas or oil deposits.

This bill calls primarily for a study, which is a necessary preliminary for designating any area as a marine sanctuary. No area could actually be so designated without further action by the Congress. It is important to make this clear. The purpose of our proposal is simply to determine whether any area should be considered by the Secretary and by the Congress as a restricted zone.

Secondly, the bill provides for an interim moratorium on new exploratory activities. The moratorium would apply to any area which the Secretary is in process of studying as a possible marine sanctuary. The purpose of this section 4(a), is to ensure that, once the Secretary is actively considering an area as a potential marine sanctuary, new industrial activities will not come in and destroy the environment before the study is even finished.

It has been brought to our attention that this moratorium is perhaps too broad in its application, and may deprive those who have already established a claim to use of the affected areas, of their proper rights and privileges. Accordingly, we have drafted two alternatives to this section. Either one would

protect the rights of any person who has a legitimate claim arising from previous investments or activities. The longer of these two alternatives, which are attached to my brief, would provide for public hearings on any claim.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out and emphasize that our objective is not to inhibit development of new mineral resources in America's offshore waters, but to establish a rational balance of uses in our marine environments. As our industrial technology begins to reach out further and further into the ocean's depths, it is vital to the present and future generations of Americans to foster and promote balanced use of this rich environment.

Industrial and mining development can go hand in hand with fishing, recreation, conservation, and scientific uses of the seas, if we are wise enough to see that these various uses are made compatible with each other. The objectives of H.R. 11584 are fully in tune with the broad purposes of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, which purposes are to inaugurate the new era of oceanography on a rationally planned basis and to maximize the benefits of this new ocean frontier for all Americans.

With a far-sighted approach we can avoid some of the mistakes of our Nation's earlier frontier experience in exploiting our irreplaceable natural resources. The tragic waste and destruction which has come to many of the Nation's estuarine areas must not be allowed to happen to the vast new wealth which is opening up before us in the depths of the oceans.

So what we have done is ask in this legislation for a study of the areas in which there are potential conflicts of uses, and we ask that this study be made by the Department of the Interior. And since that time I have had second thoughts about that and would, I believe, be more in favor of a study to be made by an independent agency, one outside the Government, of the stature of the kinds of commissions that have been established for similar purposes in the field of oceanography in recent years.

We feel that in the public interest we must plan for the future and the proper utilization of our coastal waters, including all the waters of the Continental Shelf, as well as adjacent estuarine areas.

I have, Mr. Chairman, some editorial comments that I think would lend to the interest and knowledge of the committee, and which would help to motivate us in our deliberations.

There was an editorial in the Cape Cod Standard Times dealing with this subject, suggesting that oil exploration proceed only with great caution. There are editorials from numerous papers throughout the country, on the west coast and in the central areas of our country, as well as on the shore lines of the east coast.

There are news stories describing miles of dead fish sighted where oil companies were conducting exploration.

The area that is of particular interest to me, and I believe to the Nation, is George's Bank, a fishing area which is the most prolific in the world. Thirteen nations fish here, and 1,650 million pounds of fish are caught here each year. The U.S. fisheries catch used to be almost 1 billion pounds there. It is now down to slightly under 700 million pounds per year. Of this, the Massachusetts catch is about half a million pounds.

By far the largest percentage of edible fish consumed in the U.S. markets comes from George's Bank, and it represents 12 percent of the world's fish catch.

What a tragedy it would be if there were alternative sites for the digging for oil, or drilling for oil, to those on George's Bank. And yet the possibility exists that this might be one that was most desirable from an oil industry point of view for early exploitation.

So this is one of the areas that needs to be studied first, insofar as its utilization as a natural and national resource is concerned.

THE CONCERNED SEEK WAYS TO MAKE MINING SAFE

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the February 19, 1969, issue of the Washington, D.C., Evening Star:

THE CONCERNED SEEK WAYS TO MAKE MINING SAFE

(By Shirley Elder)

Death comes in many forms as it stalks the coal miner. It comes slowly in black dust so fine it cannot be seen. It comes swiftly in highly explosive odorless gases. It comes in weak mine walls and roofs deep underground, or cave-ins, or wrong-way maps. It comes in any one of a dozen little accidents that can suddenly take a life.

Year after year, the miners themselves have shrugged off the dangers and plunged into the earth. It is part of the job, they would say, and the pay is good.

This attitude of fatalism has been one of the greatest barriers to making the mines safe, according to the director of the Interior Department's Bureau of Mines, John O'Leary.

Stewart L. Udall, the former interior secretary, said the same thing in December at a special meeting called after 78 men were buried in a fiery mine explosion in Mannington, W. Va.

"We consider ourselves an enlightened people," Udall told the assemblage of industry, union and government men. "Ours is an affluent society, technologically as advanced as any on earth."

"Yet, we accepted, even condoned, an attitude of fatalism that belongs to an age darker than the deepest recesses of any coal mine."

IMPROVES INSPECTIONS

He said the mines must be made safe. And O'Leary agreed.

A man who spends his working life in a mine now faces one chance in 12 of being killed in an accident and at least one chance in 5 of suffering lung disease. Sometimes the ailment, known as "black lung," merely weakens a man; often it puts him out of work.

In an interview, O'Leary talked of his hopes for improving the lot of the men in the mines. "I see the bureau as the trustee for the health and safety of the nation's miners," he said. "I can criticize us for being behind, but now the time has come to move forward."

O'Leary, a 42-year-old career federal officer, has made some changes since Mannington. In a batch of seven directives, he beefed up the inspection system.

Probably the most important advance is the increased number of spot checks of mines. Coal operators often have known in the past when the inspectors were coming and, according to miners and union officials, would hastily cover over safety rule infractions until the inspectors moved on.

KNOW THEIR ROUTINE

"Coal operators know their (the inspectors') routine," W. A. (Tony) Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers, said recently. "This has not changed over the years."

"They know the inspectors visit the large mines three times a year and the small mines twice a year. When the inspector has com-

pleted his work and departed, the operator knows he won't be back for four months."

"At the end of about three months and three weeks, the operator, who has ignored the law, starts putting his mine in shape."

"All men who die in disasters die needlessly."

A total of 309 U.S. miners died in 1968. The largest number of deaths, 99, resulted from collapses of roof, face or mine ribs. The next-ranking killer, gas and dust explosions, took 88 lives, including the 78 at Mannington.

Also, 38 men died in haulage accidents; 17 in electrical mishaps, and 15 through machinery breakdowns.

PRE-18TH CENTURY

West Virginia led the list of mine deaths with 150 men killed.

"It's not only shocking. It's pre-18th century," said Rep. Ken Hechler, a Democrat from West Virginia's 4th District, a large coal-producing area. "But the guilt must be shared. Both Congress and the state legislatures have been notoriously negligent in writing strict mine safety laws."

"I certainly am guilty for not jumping up and down sooner," Hechler said. "I was taken in by the loud noises from the experts (such as union leaders). I thought they knew what they were doing."

He also accused the United Mine Workers of concentrating too much on wage demands and too little on health and safety and of being willing to compromise year after year with something ineffective.

Now, Hechler has struck out on his own in a one-man crusade for strict health and safety measures in the mines. Seizing the disaster at Mannington as a take-off point, he has launched a barrage of statements, appeals, legislative proposals.

Along the way, he has joined, or been joined by: A trio of West Virginia doctors campaigning against the "black lung" disease, pneumoconiosis; veteran consumer champion Ralph Nader, and, finally, the miners themselves.

DIVINE RIGHT TO LIVE

"Today is a history-making day for West Virginia and the nation," Hechler shouted at a miners' rally in Charleston two months after the Mannington mine was sealed. "You are assembled here to secure your rights . . ."

"Yes, coal miners have a divine right to live, to breathe the fresh air, to be compensated for black lung, to work in safe surroundings, to be protected by 20th century safety standards, and to keep the precious gift of good health."

Back in his office, the generally soft-spoken Hechler mused, "Nothing like that ever happened before. There were 3,000 miners at that meeting."

At the rally, he had twice offended the UMW. First, urging support for his own bill in Congress, Hechler said a UMW plan to split health and safety proposals into separate legislation would kill them both.

"I predict today," he said, "That if you allow health and safety legislation to be separated, the steam will go out of the public support which you have for the legislation and you'll wind up with the same kind of weak bill which is now on the statute books."

WOULD FINE MINERS

To that Hechler added his opinion that coal miners themselves ought to be fined if they willfully violate safety standards.

"I disagree with Tony Boyle on this," he said, referring to the UMW chief. "I think it is unfair to the thousands of coal miners who follow the safety standards to have some oddball with a cigarette come along and blow the rest of you up."

In a statement surprising even to some union men, Boyle said he doubted whether any coal miner had violated mine safety laws. But even if they had, Boyle said, full

responsibility rests with the operators; miners pay the penalty with their lives.

At one point during his campaign, Hechler read a statement prepared by his collaborator, Nader.

Nader assailed coal companies for "corporate profiteering" at the expense of miner's health and safety and said union leadership has been "insensitive and inactive" toward the needs of the very men they are supposed to represent, the miners.

"Yes, the United Mine Workers Journal gives you the comforting words and the sad regrets: But when the chips are down, the UMW leadership follows the lead of the coal mine operators in Washington and in the coal mining states," Nader wrote.

UMW JOURNAL REPLIES

That was the final straw for the UMW. Its journal, which comes out twice a month, rushed to press with a page one message to union members from editor Justin McCarthy:

"There are some arrogant troublemakers scurrying about—or sending messages to the coal fields these days trying, for devious motives of their own, to convince the members of the UMW that your union is not doing its job in behalf of safety and health for coal miners."

UMW International Vice President George J. Titler took the time to remind Hechler, in a long letter, that the UMW had been one of his supporters.

He said he was "astounded" by Hechler's remarks and his alliance with Nader—"I wondered why you had turned on your friends." He advised Hechler to become a co-sponsor, along with West Virginia congressmen, of the two UMW-written health and safety bills. And he warned that future Hechler re-election campaigns might be run without UMW help.

STANDS BY BILL

Hechler said he will stand by his bill, which covers both health and safety.

He said the UMW already has given up on the effort to force coal operators to strengthen and enforce healthier working conditions.

Despite public pronouncements to the contrary, UMW is saying "behind the scenes" that the health bill cannot pass, Hechler said. "I don't like that."

McCarthy said Hechler just doesn't understand the facts. He pointed out that UMW has been fighting for better mine conditions for 78 years. But the issues are complex and the study of miners' lung disease is new and controversial, he said.

The editor indicated the union feels Congress will act on only one thing at a time, and that safety has a better chance than health at this time. But, he said, the UMW will push for both.

SEES BETTER GOP BILL

Mine Bureau Chief O'Leary, like Hechler, wants a single bill. Two proposals were prepared by the outgoing Democratic administration, and introduced in Congress.

O'Leary said the Republicans also will offer their own bill, which he predicts will be better written and stronger, to Congress within the next couple of weeks.

O'Leary said he sees the forces of reform coming together uniquely this year in a winning combination, largely galvanized by the Mannington disaster.

At the Interior Department, there is a new administration and new determination for something to be done.

On Capitol Hill, there is Hechler's drumbeat for action, aided by others from mining districts who are perhaps less vocal but equally concerned. Hearings will begin March 4 in the House.

In West Virginia, the doctors fighting "black lung" are swept along—and into pub-

lic attention—by the horror over Mannington.

A bill in the state legislature would extend workmen's compensation to men disabled by lungs coated with black dust. It has been estimated that as many as 125,000 of the nation's 144,000 coal miners suffer from some degree of coal dust disease.

RESISTANCE IN INDUSTRY

Among coal producers, there is continuing resistance. Washington representatives refused to comment on pending legislation, but in West Virginia, they have described the current drive as an "unrealistic attack" and "highly emotional."

They speak of the wealth the coal industry has restored to Appalachia and the enormous cost to the industry of imposing stiffer standards and penalties.

Yet, the coal industry is doing better than it was a few years ago. The National Coal Association refers to its product as the "fuel of the future." Use of coal by electric utilities alone offers enormous growth, and research in converting coal to oil and gas also is under way.

The coal association estimates that total U.S. coal consumption will reach 643 million tons by 1972 of which the utilities will use 367 tons.

Coal demand could rise to a billion tons a year by 1980—twice the 1967 output—if gas and oil experiments develop as expected. Even at that pace, U.S. reserves now estimated at 3.2 trillion tons, would last 3,000 years.

UNITED STATES FAR AHEAD

U.S. coal production outstrips the rest of the world at a dramatic rate, creating profits certainly, but also creating problems.

The association's latest statistics show the average daily coal output per miner in the United States is 18.52 tons, compared to a 2.87-ton average in England and 3.23 in West Germany.

At the same time, however, European safety standards are higher and more strictly enforced.

One of the explanations for the greater productivity in this country also is a cause of growing cases of lung disease, the "continuous" use of mining machines.

Controlled by one man, these machines tear the coal from the earth's black seam with spinning steel teeth at rates as high as 12 tons per minute. They also churn up unparalleled amounts of dust.

FIVE-STEP PROCEDURE

The so-called conventional system is a five-step procedure. Mobile cutters, built like giant chain saws, carve into the coal. Holes are drilled and the chunks of coal blasted loose with non-flery chemicals. The coal then is ripped out and scooped up onto conveyers that carry it out of the mine.

If Congress accepts coal dust standards suggested by the Public Health Service (three milligrams per cubic yard), producers would have to give up the continuous mining machines or devise a system for dampening or diluting the dust.

The stage is set for a real battle as the scene shifts to Capitol Hill. The question now will be whether coal producers, medical experts and congressmen all can agree on what to do.

COMMEMORATE THE BIRTH OF THE REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Estonian descent in the United States

will celebrate the 51st anniversary of independence of the Republic of Estonia proclaimed on February 24, 1918.

After the outbreak of the Second World War, Estonia suffered at the hands of both the Russians and the Nazis. The brave people of Estonia have remained victims of oppression since that time.

It is fitting on this anniversary that we join the many Americans of Estonian descent in looking to the day when Estonia and the other Baltic States are rejoined into the free community of nations. The people of our country are willing and determined to lend their moral support to the rightful aspirations of Estonia. In recognition of such determination, we join on this 24th day of February in commemorating the birth of the great Republic of Estonia.

H.R. 338 AND H.R. 340 GAIN PRESS SUPPORT

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members of this body would be interested in the continuing support shown by the press for the Program Information Act, H.R. 338, and for the Executive Reorganization and Management Improvement Act, H.R. 340. There two bills are now cosponsored by 185 Members and by 166 Members respectively. A few examples from across the Nation follow: [From the Quincy (Ill.) Herald-Whig, Jan. 26, 1969]

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Typical, perhaps, of the kind of thinking that may motivate the 91st Congress, now getting under way under a new President, are two bills launched by a Delaware Republican congressman, William V. Roth, Jr., who has gained a co-sponsoring support that embraces nearly a third of the House, on a bipartisan basis. The bills call for full public information on federal assistance programs and for the establishment of a Hoover-type commission to create some reforms in government organization.

The two-pronged attack which the two bills would mount stem from an eight-month study Roth reported to Congress last June. Among other disclosures, the study noted that while the federal government is spending some \$20 billion a year on federal assistance programs, "no one, anywhere, knows how many programs there are; information on some programs is virtually impossible to obtain; and a significant lack of coordination between federal agencies has created scores of overlapping and duplicate programs."

The first of Roth's bills, which has been co-sponsored by 165 members of Congress, from both sides of the aisle, requires full disclosure of information relating to all federal programs in a comprehensive catalog. It also requires the President to make annual recommendations to simplify and consolidate programs, wherever possible. A companion bill is being introduced in the Senate by Sen. J. Caleb Boggs, R-Del., and nine co-sponsors.

Roth, it might be added, has no illusions about his reforms. Of his information bill, for example, he has commented: "This legislation is essential but it is not a cure-all. It is, however, a building block—a badly needed building block—to make our federal assistance programs more meaningful, more manageable and more creative."

It is that attitude, perhaps, which has attracted such a bipartisan support. Locally, for example, co-sponsors of the bill include our own 20th Illinois District Republican Rep. Paul Findley, and Democratic Rep. Bill Hungate, who represents the vast northeast segment of Missouri.

There is almost equal co-sponsorship for Roth's second bill, with 155 congressmen backing it. (Findley and Hungate are also co-sponsors of this proposal). And another Delaware Republican, Sen. John Williams, who has been an outspoken fiscal reform sponsor, is introducing a parallel bill in the U.S. Senate.

That second Roth bill proposes creation of a 10-member Hoover-type commission "to objectively analyze the federal government and the federal system and give recommendations on how it can operate more effectively and more efficiently." That, admittedly, is a very large, very open, order.

Roth says his second bill differs essentially from the Hoover Commission Act because it would establish a commission charged "with studying government on a vertical plane; that is, studying the impact and effect of federal, state and local governments, especially from the standpoint of preserving and strengthening our decentralized system of government."

The proposed commission also would be charged "with the responsibility for recommending how the resources of the various levels of government can be better marshaled to meet the critical problems of the present and future."

Despite their remarkably large initial support, Congressman Roth's two bills could get lost in the shuffle—or in the grinding partisan politics the 91st Congress may produce. But both deserve the most serious consideration. Study may show the need for some minor changes, but it is difficult to see how either can be faulted when considering the goals of each.

[From the Huntington (W. Va.), Advertiser, Jan. 27, 1969]

STUDY OF U.S. AID PROGRAMS

Any proposal of Republican congressmen to investigate programs initiated under a Democratic administration is suspect on general principles.

The measures proposed by Rep. William V. Roth Jr., R-Del., with the cosponsorship of more than one-third of the membership of the House, however, may be an exception.

One of the bills calls for full information on all federal assistance programs, and the other would open the way for creating a commission for developing recommendations to improve government through reorganization.

The proposed legislation grew out of an extensive study of the \$20-billion annual assistance program by Rep. Roth last year.

Regarding the study, he said, "No one, anywhere, knows how many programs there are; information on some programs is virtually impossible to obtain; and a significant lack of coordination between federal agencies has created scores of overlapping and duplicative programs."

How much partisan political motivation there is behind the bills we do not pretend to know, but controversies over the operations of the various agencies indicate that information about them might help clear up some of the difficulties.

A particularly valuable provision in the Program Information Act would be that requiring the President to make annual recommendations for simplifying and consolidating programs.

Government agencies organized to meet critical needs have a way of branching out and overlapping. Even when emergency needs are met offices sometimes continue to operate in the neglected ramifications of forgotten areas.

Eliminating the agencies no longer needed and consolidating those duplicating efforts

would be one of the objectives no doubt of the proposed study commission.

Rep. Roth said the commission would study "the impact and effect of federal programs and activities upon the interrelationships of federal, state and local governments, especially from the standpoint of preserving and strengthening our decentralized system of government."

"Also," he said, "the commission would be charged with the responsibility for recommending how the resources of the various levels of government can be better marshaled to meet the critical problems of the present and future, and would consider ways of improving federal government administration other than just reshuffling and restructuring agencies and programs."

New brooms proverbially if not persistently sweep clean, and a great many Republicans will doubtless go through the motions in the next few months of rescuing the nation from the effects of Democratic management.

But a proper study of various agencies created in recent years can doubtless improve services and reduce expenditures. That should be the purpose of this proposed new legislation.

[From the Davenport (Iowa) Times Democrat, Jan. 22, 1969]

TWO-PRONGED ATTACK

The first step to clean up the federal establishment, determine the number of federal bureaus, agencies, departments and what not and to find out where duties and programs overlap has been launched.

A bill sponsored by U.S. Rep. William V. Roth Jr., R-Del., and backed by more than one-third of the membership of the House of Representatives, is the opening shot in a two-pronged attack aimed at providing needed reforms in the federal establishment. It also will be introduced in the U.S. Senate by Sen. J. Caleb Boggs, R-Del., where it has nine co-sponsors.

The second prong of the attack will be another bill to be introduced in the House by Roth and in the Senate by Sen. John Williams, R-Del.

The first bill, now under study, would require full information disclosure on all federal assistance programs, and the other would create a modern Hoover-type commission.

Roth's bills follow an eight-month study of federal assistance programs. He described his first bill as "the opening shot, demonstrative of the thinking and sentiment of Congress" and "An early indicator of some of the things members of the 91st Congress will be trying to do."

He noted that while the federal government is spending more than \$20 billion a year on federal assistance programs, "no one, anywhere, knows how many programs there are; information on some programs is practically impossible to obtain, and a significant lack of cooperation between federal agencies has created scores of overlappings and duplicative programs."

The first of the two Roth bills is titled, "Program Information Act," and the second, "Executive Reorganization and Management Act."

The former requires full disclosure of information relating to all federal programs each year in a comprehensive catalog. It also requires the President to make annual recommendations on simplifying and consolidating programs, their guidelines and access requirements.

"This legislation is essential," he said, "but not a cure-all. It is, however, a building block—a badly needed building block—to make our federal assistance programs more meaningful, more manageable and more creative."

The second bill would require the creation of a 10-member Hoover-type commission to objectively analyze the federal gov-

ernment and the federal system and give recommendations on how it can operate more effectively and efficiently.

The bill differs in two main areas from traditional Hoover Commission bills, Roth said.

"Besides the traditional functions of Hoover Commissions, under this bill the commission would be charged with studying government on a vertical plane; that is, studying the impact and effect of federal programs and activities upon the interrelationship of federal, state and local governments, especially from the standpoint of preserving and strengthening our decentralized system of government," he said.

"Also, the commission would be charged with the responsibility for recommending how the resources of the various levels of government can be better marshaled to meet the critical problems of the present and future, and would consider ways of improving federal government administration other than just reshuffling and restructuring agencies and programs."

Evidently what Rep. Roth would like to do is have the way paved for an understandable table of organization in the government, with each agency, bureau and department occupying its individual line. Then, if two or more agencies appear qualified for a certain line, examine them, retaining the proper agency and eliminating the others.

Such a program could not only help the taxpayer, but the system of government as well, Rep. Roth's bills have merit.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Tribune, Jan. 24, 1969]

OVERHAUL OF FEDERAL SYSTEMS DESERVES BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

One goal of President Richard Nixon that is assured of significant support in the Democrat-controlled Congress is overhaul of federal government procedures.

House bills introduced last week by Rep. William V. Roth, Jr., R-Del., call for disclosure of full information on all federal assistance programs and the creation of a new "Hoover Commission."

The bills are co-sponsored by more than one-third of the membership of the House of Representatives, both Democrats and Republicans.

Democratic Congressional leaders have been calling for revisions since the mass of Great Society legislation in 1964 and 1965.

According to a study concluded last June, the federal government is spending more than \$20 billion annually on federal assistance programs, "but no one, anywhere, knows how many programs there are; information on some programs is virtually impossible to obtain; and a significant lack of coordination between federal agencies has created scores of overlapping and duplicative programs."

Since 1953, however—the last time a Hoover Commission took a look at government organization—the government has taken on 100 new major activities. Grant-in-aid programs to state and local governments have jumped from a handful to more than 160. They are managed by 21 agencies, 150 bureaus and 400 regional and field offices.

There are 57 programs in job training, 35 in housing, 20 in transportation, 62 in community facilities, 32 in land use, 28 in recreation and culture, 65 in health and almost 100 in education.

Those figures merely emphasize the magnitude of the task of cutting red tape and duplication. Methods of counting vary, so there is little agreement on the number of federal programs.

The Program Information Act introduced by Roth would require full disclosure of information in a catalogue form relating to all government programs each year. It would require the President to make annual recom-

mendations on simplifying and consolidating programs, their guidelines and access requirements.

The second bill would require the creation of a 10-member commission to analyze objectively the federal government and recommend means to make it operate more efficiently and effectively.

The Commission would focus primarily on the interrelationships of federal, state and local programs with the intention of preserving a decentralized system of government.

Mr. Nixon has indicated he will concentrate on trying to make old programs work rather than seeking new ones. First, of course, he must determine what the old programs are.

Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, D-Mont., and former vice presidential candidate Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, D-Maine, have called upon the Senate for reform. In the House, Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills, D-Ark., has advocated creation of a new Hoover Commission.

Despite the bipartisan support, reform will meet with resistance. Shifting of programs means that chairmen of some of the appropriations committees lose influence.

It is apparent, however, that some legislation is essential to make federal assistance programs more meaningful.

The Roth bills are a first step. The reception they receive in the House and Senate will be an early indicator of the attitude of the 91st Congress toward bringing efficiency to government.

[From the Johnson City (Tenn.) Press-Chronicle, Jan. 24, 1969]

CAN WE CONTROL IT?

More than 150 congressmen have joined in an ambitious effort to make the federal government more efficient and understandable. We wish them success.

Led by Rep. William V. Roth of Delaware, their immediate objectives include passage of bills (1) to require disclosure of full information on all federal aid programs, and (2) to create a modern version of the Hoover Commission to make an objective analysis of government operations.

These measures are outgrowths of a report last year by Roth that while the government is spending more than \$20 billion a year on assistance programs, "no one, anywhere, knows how many programs there are, information on some of them is impossible to obtain, and a significant lack of coordination between federal agencies has created scores of overlapping and duplicative functions."

Under the disclosure bill, details of all federal programs would be compiled and published each year in a comprehensive catalog which would be made available to federal, state and local governments. Under the government operations bill (Hoover-type commission), a 10-member commission would make a penetrating study of government in all its aspects, particularly the interrelationships of federal, state and local units. It would bring in recommendations for more efficient administration.

The Johnson City Press-Chronicle supports both these bills. Unless government is brought within control of the people by these and similar measures, the reverse may happen—that is, people may find themselves controlled by government without hope of rescue.

The very bigness of the federal structure has caused some to liken it to a Frankenstein. We created it. Theoretically, it is responsible to us. But its growth is so stupendous that some fear it is beyond control. We do not take this negative view. We believe the people still have the power to control their government—if they will only exercise it.

[From the Berwick (Pa.) Enterprise,
Jan. 25, 1969]

A NEEDED REFORM

We were glad to see that Rep. Herman Schneebell, who formerly represented this district, is among the more than one third of the U.S. House of Representatives who are joining in what has been described as the "opening shot of a two-pronged attack aimed at providing some needed reforms in the Federal establishment."

Led by Rep. W. V. Roth, Jr., (R-Del) the group seeks the reforms through passage of a bill to require full information disclosure on all Federal assistance programs. It also seeks a bill to create a modern Hoover-type Commission.

Roth made an eight-month, intensive study of Federal "assistance" programs and he is well aware that something needs to be done.

He has pointed out—in the Congressional Record—that while the Feds are spending more than \$20,000,000,000 per year on so-called Federal assistance programs, "no one, anywhere, knows how many programs there are; information on some programs is virtually impossible to obtain and a significant lack of coordination between Federal agencies has created scores of overlapping and duplicative programs."

It is known there are roughly ten times the number of assistance programs there had been when the Eisenhower Administration ended.

Roth feels duplication of cost and effort, plus worthless programs that merely make it possible to have a lot of people in jobs at high salaries, should be eliminated. He also feels the whole matter should be brought out into the open, so that those who are paying the bill can know where their money is being wasted. Then, we presume, they will do something about it.

It would seem that President Nixon's work is cut out for him, in eliminating some of the horrible waste, among other important tasks. The Roth movement should be a big help in getting the routing-out started.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State,
Jan. 29, 1969]

FIGHT AGAINST ODDS

The honor of being a "David" of the 20th Century by rights must go to Rep. William V. Roth, the Delaware congressman who is tackling the Goliath known as federal assistance.

Last year, climaxing eight months of arduous and often unrewarding study on his part and that of his limited staff, Representative Roth came up with an eye-opening—and jaw-dropping—report on the magnitude of federal assistance programs. Although thwarted time and again in his efforts to enumerate all such programs, the Delaware congressman nevertheless managed to pinpoint something like 1,090 programs which he listed (at considerable length) in the *Congressional Record* of last June 25.

Those thousand programs, by the way, came to light with only 520 answers to the 1,271 questionnaires he sent throughout the federal establishment. He sent 478 questionnaires to agencies of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare alone, receiving only 21 back before some high-ranking bureaucrat directed HEW program managers to send the Roth questionnaires to him rather than to Roth.

Speaking to the House, Roth said that "not only will they not provide the information about their activities, the HEW officials with whom I have had to deal seem unconcerned about, even unaware of, the information needs of our state and local officials who must apply for federal programs and for whom the programs were established in the first place."

But the HEW episode represents only one of the frustrations encountered by Congressman Roth, as witness this statement to the House:

"We found that no one, anywhere, knows exactly how many federal programs there are.

"We found that nowhere is there a central, comprehensive repository where meaningful information on all operating programs can be found.

"We found that more than \$20 billion a year is being spent on such programs, yet only with long and great effort can one begin to find meaningful information about all of them . . ."

This year, Representative Roth and more than 150 of his colleagues are picking up where he left off last year. They are sponsoring two pieces of legislation:

A "Program Information Act" which would require full disclosure each year in catalog form of information relating to all federal programs, along with presidential recommendations for simplifying and consolidating such programs.

"An Executive Reorganization and Management Improvement Act" which would create a 10-member, Hoover-type commission to analyze the federal government and the federal system with the aim of developing greater effectiveness and efficiency.

What Representative Roth is proposing by way of legislation should be a challenge for executive action by President Nixon. Much of what the congressman seeks in the way of information could be provided through determined action by the executive department. And the whole tenor of the Nixon campaign argues for executive cooperation in the Roth effort.

But if it be appropriate to liken Mr. Roth to David, as we did at the outset, it may be equally fitting to indicate that he will need the patience of Job before his task is done.

We wish him God-speed.

THE 48TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN REVOLT AGAINST THE SOVIETS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 18 marked the 48th anniversary of the Armenian revolt against the Soviet Union which was holding their area illegally. Despite the heroism of the Armenian people during the revolt, they were overcome by force of arms of the overwhelming manpower of the Communist forces and remain to this day captives of communism.

The Armenian uprising was especially tragic in that Soviet control of the area was reasserted just 2 months earlier under the pretext of providing freedom and protection.

In this day and age when colonialism is still a major issue on the U.N. agenda, we must reemphasize that the only major colonial power existing today is the U.S.S.R.

We must further reemphasize that the Armenian people and other captive nations of communism must be free if the principle of self-determination of peoples is to be effectively honored.

Mr. Speaker, we must take practical steps on behalf of the oppressed people

of Armenia and other captives within the U.S.S.R. Neither the Voice of America nor Radio Free Europe is doing an effective job of broadcasting behind the Iron Curtain. We must take practical steps to see that a message of trust rather than appeasement of communism is beamed to the patient people of Armenia so that they will continue to realize that one day their hopes for freedom will be rewarded.

PARTICIPATORY POLITICS COME TO WALL STREET

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, we are in a period in our history when young people are clamoring for an opportunity to participate in the decisions and institutions which shape their lives and affect the fabric of our society at large. Wise leaders have been willing to accept the legitimate role of young people in these activities and have moved in the direction of what has come to be known as participatory democracy. It is interesting to note that participatory democracy is not the province solely of our educational and political institutions, but also business institutions.

For example, the recent remarks of Mr. Howard Stein, president of the Dreyfus Fund, would seem to indicate that participatory democracy has arrived on Wall Street. Mr. Stein's comments, which I insert at this point in the Record, testify to the positive and innovative results which can accrue when young people are given an opportunity to direct their initiative, creative talents, energy, and enterprise toward responsible tasks.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF HOWARD STEIN, INSTITUTIONAL INVESTOR CONFERENCE, JANUARY 23, 1969

Wall Street, like everyone else, has its generation gap. The Campus has its restless rebels; we have our hedge funds and conglomerates.

To me there is a very clear parallel between the excitement for change on campus, and the young, bold, imaginative, sometimes brash and sometimes irritating behavior of the investment and corporate Swingers.

In each case, there have been excesses—on campus, the often reckless and self-defeating attempts at takeover for its own sake; in the investment community an equally indiscriminate hunger at times for instant gratification.

In each case, there is easy temptation to be repelled by the outward unpleasantness of these symptoms of change. But just as no university president can afford to ignore student demands, neither can we of the Establishment afford to ignore the challenge now being hurled at traditional Establishment principles of money management.

I think we owe a debt of gratitude to the Swingers. Despite their abandon and their abrasive techniques they have created the tensions that drive us, that make it a little harder for us to doze off on past performance.

I think it would be a serious mistake to write off the new Swingers and their works as merely a passing aberration.

I suggest that they are clues to deep and permanent changes, that we must know about and must be prepared to act on.

The keynote of this change is participation:

Not just for material rewards—but participation in the decisions that are made, the quality of the decisions, and what is created by these decisions.

It would be a bad reading to see in the temper and behavior of the young no more than a desire to drop out. I think for the most part they want to drop in. They want to take on The Establishment, not destroy it—modify it so they can participate in a way that will give them not only profit but authority as well.

Nobody should know better than we about the value of participation. Few among us would have believed 20 years ago that the upstart mutual funds would have become the means by which millions of individuals came to participate in our great industrial growth. What many regarded as a threat has become a means through which the investment community has created the largest public constituency in his history, at the same time contributing to the depth and strength of the market.

We should be the last to deny the same kind of participation to the young people and to the go-go breed—and for good sound practical reasons. For no matter how Establishment we are, we have to admire and have to enlist their initiative, creativity, energies and enterprise. These are all virtues in every field—the qualities that set them off from the run of the mill people.

How can we in the Establishment make use of these new forces?

First we have to give up our superficial prejudices toward some of the strange folkways of the new Swingers.

What separates us now is an unwillingness of either side to pay attention to the other. It is hard to say who is more impatient, the young who see the Establishment as paralyzed by the past, or the Establishment who sees the young dizzy with unreality.

This generation gap is a cut apart, as different of its kind as when the schools began to teach that the earth goes around the sun instead of the other way around.

The day you could buy participation with a title, and a key to the washroom, and the pension plan is over.

The good grey corporation, no matter how much it pays, will be unable to keep the kind of talent it will need to perform in today's world.

We must learn to distribute the risk-taking responsibility, together, with the here and now rewards.

The man with the qualities that we admire in the new Swingers is not looking for jobs or for security. He is pursuing a life style.

For that reason, beyond a certain wage level, the corporation that enjoys a reputation for promoting its free spirits will almost automatically command the best performance.

One of the most exciting incentives that we have to offer the new Swingers lies in our responsibility to light fires under caretaker and custodial managements grown comfortable under the protective wing of custodial money managers. It's an idling reciprocating engine.

By this I do not mean the answer lies in the indiscriminate use of investment power to heat up earnings, or give a misleading picture of hyper-performance. I mean the disciplined and imaginative use of our abilities in pursuit of our responsibilities.

Another incentive we have to offer is the chance to be "where the action is." As a number of us in the investment community have come to know, true performance is good management; performance investing is knowing what the facts are; performance investing is mobilizing more data; performance investing is thinking logically; performance investing is throwing out all the

gossip and old wives' tales that have made up so much of the literature and the practice in investment.

Yet another incentive is our capacity to put into being concepts and ideas with ease and rapidity; to find ways to use ideas and imagination.

I have spent a lot of time talking about participation and incentives. Our own response to these trends will take the form of incentives based upon the performance of each of our new funds. In turn, these will be reflected in incentive payments to the individuals who participate in the management of these funds. If approved by the regulatory bodies the incentive payments will fluctuate in relation to the revenues we receive from the performance of each of these funds. I believe this is the basic concept of participation. It is my best hope that it becomes the pattern for the institutional investment industry to adopt for its own needs.

In paying attention to these interesting new challenges, we should not overlook an old problem that is still with us.

There is a present and continuing danger in treating speculation and performance as if they were interchangeable, and I think we are at a point where some reasonable concern needs to be expressed about what I believe can be called not just the cult of performance, but the cult of performance in search of instant gratification.

Speculation has always been with us in the marketplace. Individual speculators can move in and out of the market with ease. If the individual speculator does well, it adds zest to the market, and when individual speculation goes badly, it is too small to be a spoiler.

My concern with institutional speculation is with the tendency of institutional investors to imitate the movements of the individual speculator.

Not only mutual funds but insurance companies, pension funds and universities are following the speculator in search of immediate fast performance.

Traditionally, the role of the fiduciary institution has been to preserve capital, rather than seek capital appreciation, and speculation for the fiduciaries, was a "no man's land."

The speculator, as he has been understood, has been thought of as a single investor with a responsibility no larger than his own cash.

The speculative direction being taken by some fiduciaries threatens to upset the traditional balance in the marketplace between the single speculator and the fiduciary dealing with large sums of money and a collective responsibility.

If the performance cult becomes the continuing objective of fiduciaries, the future excessive adjustments could make the marketplace a wasteland.

In a very large measure, I think the fiduciaries were forced, as a defensive measure, to adopt the cult of performance as their own. Over the years, the fiduciaries understood the term responsibility to mean custodial and conservative.

If nothing else the Swingers have taught us that fiduciary responsibility is more than mere caretaking. Our responsibility involves the capacity to respond to change and to new ideas.

How do we cultivate and maintain this capacity? Add a good dose of participation together with meaningful incentives; stay alert to the ideas and experiments that come from our activists and militants; search and dig for innovative techniques that give flexibility to a large, institutional portfolio; actively search for people able to make decisions—when you find one hire him first and worry about what he will do afterwards; and by all means avoid time-consuming committee meetings.

One more thing: We have to avoid the kind

of self-serving activity that may in the end be hazardous not only to ourselves individually, but to the entire community.

A few years ago, a book appeared on the market entitled, "How Much Does It Cost When It's Free?" When the temptation to instant gratification arises, as it does often these days, we ought to ask ourselves before plunging after it: How much will today's techniques used in performance cost us tomorrow?

GREAT PUBLIC SERVANTS FROM TEXAS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, when President Johnson left office, the event not only marked his closing out a 37-year career in Washington, but it also marked a break in the public careers of many other dedicated officials.

A number of these men were Texans, and I would like to take a moment to reflect on some of the ones who carried the heaviest burdens during President Johnson's term.

As I think back on the men who worked under our former President, it is difficult to single out those to mention. Of course, there were many fine people associated with the Johnson administration, but there were only a few Texans who attained positions of the highest trust and responsibility. During the Johnson years, there were three Texans who were appointed to Cabinet-level posts. Also, there were two top-level White House advisers from my hometown of Austin, and I would like to pause a moment to review the background and accomplishments of these men.

W. Marvin Watson began his career in Longview, Tex., as a special assistant to the president of Lone Star Steel Corp. From that post, he radiated to public service, and soon became executive secretary for the Texas State Democratic Executive Committee. It was from this position that he began his career in Washington, coming to join the White House staff soon after President Johnson took office.

As you know, Mr. Watson ultimately was appointed to the job of Postmaster General and attained great credit for his outstanding job in working to improve postal service. In his short term as Postmaster General, he left a mark which is still with us today. In the course of his 15-hour days, 6-day weeks, he came up with far-reaching recommendations on improvements we now are seeing brought about. Marvin Watson tackled this job with the attitude that it could be just as important as he wanted to make it, and he can certainly be proud of his fine efforts and of the position of high esteem he has achieved.

Former Attorney General Ramsey Clark is noted for his outstanding academic accomplishments both in law and in government. He began his legal career with 10 years of service in a Dallas law firm and became eminently ac-

quainted with the day-to-day confrontations seen in the law. His first position in public office was as Deputy Attorney General for the Lands Division, and he served here with distinction. From this position he was elevated to serve as Deputy Attorney General immediately under Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach. Mr. Clark later succeeded his own boss and became well and widely known for his intelligent and courageous efforts as Attorney General.

Ramsey Clark is an able and dedicated public servant. He is a gentleman in the first sense of the word, and he believed deeply in the protection of rights for all citizens. He rendered distinguished service to his country—and at a critical time during domestic crises which required a cool head.

C. R. Smith, former Secretary of Commerce, was one of the original founders of American Airlines. His service and success in the aviation industry corresponds with the fantastic growth of aviation itself, and the mark of distinction he won in private enterprise ably fortified him to represent the commercial activity and industry of the greatest Nation in history.

As Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Smith's job was to keep tabs on the commercial activities and growth of our country, and he was both eminently and immediately qualified for these responsibilities. Mr. C. R., as we affectionately call him, proved himself a friend of business, and a protector of the American public. He understood the problems of business and commerce, yet he knew progress was a partnership between business and labor, and that the public interest must come first.

As a final word about each of the Cabinet officers just mentioned, I would note that to the man, each stayed at his desk right up to the last hour—working around the clock—and I feel that they are due a great deal of credit for the smooth transition we recently enjoyed.

In addition to these three Cabinet members, there were two Texans from Austin who earned and deserved special positions of trust.

George Christian joined the White House staff from a full and varied background of journalism, generally at the State level. A former writer for the International News Service, he served as special assistant to Texas Govs. Price Daniel and John Connally. His service with President Johnson immediately involved him in one of the most sensitive jobs anyone could have. He served as White House Press Secretary for over 3 years and in retrospect, I believe we could say that he always handled himself with the poise and dignity so essential in this position.

George Christian, often referred to as "Mr. Unflappable," is truly a man who understands the feelings of those with whom he deals and who is always aware of the winds and currents presented in any situation. He was as steady as a rock of Texas granite.

Larry Temple also served as special assistant under Texas Gov. John Connally and enjoyed a most successful career at the White House. An honor

student at The University of Texas School of Law, he engaged in the private practice of law for 3 years in Austin. Both during the years he served under Gov. John Connally and President Johnson, he has displayed a never ending countenance of quiet understanding, pleasant cooperation, and unique ability. It is unusual that a man so young in years could be so trusted by two of the top leaders of our country. But he never failed that trust—neither to the men and institutions he represented; nor to the dedication and spirit needed for his duties; nor to the public.

As has almost always been the case, men from Texas have done well when they came to Washington. Whether in an elective office or not, they have demonstrated a high sense of dedication to their responsibilities, and they have maintained a balanced view of the authority they have acquired. In my view, it is rewarding that we have had men of such high capabilities serve us, and that they were available at the proper moment in history. I wish I could mention all the able Texans who have served us so well, but I am pleased to point out a few who were here when the close of this administration took place.

I am proud to have been associated with each of them, and I know that in whatever new endeavors they may have assumed, they will continue, in their own way, to give our country the strength and purpose which comes from such leaders.

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week, the House passed, by a record vote of 305 to 79, House Resolution 89 to change the name of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Committee on Internal Security. I am pleased to say that I was one of the 305 Members to cast a vote for this measure.

I am impressed by the fact that the majority of the membership of the House is intent upon ferreting out subversive elements wherever they exist, and working in conjunction with our Department of Justice in exposing them. The fact that the committee has, from time to time, been condemned by the Communist Daily Worker and its ilk reasserts the need for such an investigative group to bring to light subversion wherever it seeks to undermine our way of life.

The change in name in no way diminishes the committee's scope nor authority. But by changing its name to Committee on Internal Security, it better defines what its true role is and that is to defend the rights of all American citizens—which in effect it always was. Those of us who supported this proposal believe it will increase the efficiency of the committee to deal effectively in areas where its attention is needed.

The chairman of this committee emphasized that one of the areas where they are going to take a hard look is the disturbances nationwide on our college campuses.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 19, 1969

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the week beginning February 16 occupies a special place in the minds of men to whom the pursuit of personal freedom and national independence is a noble and continuing purpose, for it was on this date—51 years ago—that the courageous people of Lithuania won back their freedom and established the independent Republic of Lithuania.

Though their freedom was destroyed and their independence denied as a result of the Soviet invasion of June 1940, the Lithuanian people at home and abroad, supported by freedom-loving friends throughout the world, have never surrendered their commitment to freedom.

This anniversary, therefore, is deeply significant to all who retain the hope that Lithuania will eventually reestablish herself among the independent nations of the world.

Despite Soviet oppression, the light of liberty still flickers strongly in Lithuania and throughout Eastern Europe as we have seen most dramatically in Czechoslovakia in recent months. This is why, Mr. Speaker, it is so important that we in the Congress continue to give what encouragement we can through such means as annual observances of the independence days of nations like Lithuania.

In further tribute to their indefatigable love of freedom, and for the information of our colleagues, I include as a part of my remarks in the Record the texts of resolutions adopted, first, by the members of the Linden, N.J., branch of the Lithuanian American Council and, second, by the Lithuanian people at a mass meeting in Newark sponsored by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTIONS

Unanimously adopted on February 9, 1969, by the Lithuanian Americans of Linden, N.J., gathered under the auspices of Lithuanian American Council, Linden branch, for commemoration of the 51st anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania's independence.

Whereas February 16, 1969 marks the 51st anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania as a free and independent republic; and

Whereas Lithuania, the country of our ancestors, once an independent and flourishing republic, recognized and respected by the world's major powers, was invaded and occupied by the Soviet Union in 1940, to this day its people enslaved and subjugated; and

Whereas commemorating the 51st anniversary the feeling of many Lithuanian Americans may well be guided by the words of our President, Richard M. Nixon, expressed in his inaugural speech, that "No man can be

fully free while his neighbor is not—to go forward at all is to go forward together”—Therefore, be it

Resolved, that we hereby reaffirm our determination to continue to carry on the effort whereby Lithuania once again shall regain her freedom and rightful independence; and

Resolved, that it is our hope that the representatives of our Government will firmly continue to maintain the policy of non-recognition of the incorporation by force of Lithuania in the Soviet Union; and

Resolved, that the Government of the United States be requested to take appropriate steps through the United Nations and other channels to reverse the policy of colonialism by Soviet Russia in the Baltic States and bring about re-examination of the Baltic situation with the view of re-establishing freedom and independence to these three nations; and

Resolved, that copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Richard M. Nixon; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable William F. Rogers; to the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Charles W. Yost; to the United States Senators of New Jersey, the Honorable Clifford P. Case, and the Honorable Harrison A. Williams; to the Representatives of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Congressional Districts of New Jersey, the Honorable Florence P. Dwyer and the Honorable Cornelius E. Gallagher, and to the Governor of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes.

VLADAS TURSA,

President.

MARGARITA SAMATAS,

Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

RESOLUTION

(Unanimously adopted at a meeting of American-Lithuanians and their friends living in New Jersey, sponsored by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey, held on Sunday, February 16, 1969 at St. George's Lithuanian Hall, Newark, New Jersey, in commemoration of the 51st anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.)

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania by force in June of 1940; and

Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to foreign domination and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which they rightly and deservedly enjoyed for more than seven centuries in the past; and

Whereas the Soviets have deported or killed over twenty-five per cent of the Lithuanian population since June 15, 1940; and

Whereas the House of Representatives and the United States Senate (of the 89th Congress) unanimously passed *House Concurrent Resolution 416* urging the President of the United States to direct the attention of the world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent, reaffirm our adherence to American democratic principles of government and pledge our support to our President and our Congress to achieve lasting peace, freedom and justice in the world; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States carries out the expression of the U.S. Congress contained in *H. Con. Res. 416* by bringing up the Baltic States question in the United Nations and demanding the Soviets to withdraw from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and be it further

Resolved, That the pauperization of the Lithuanian people, conversion of once free farmers into serfs on kolkozoes and sovkhoses, as well as exploitation of workers, persecution of the faithful, restriction of religious practices, and closing of houses of worship, and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded this day to the President of the United States, Secretary of State William Rogers, United States Ambassador to the United Nations Charles Yost, United States Senators from New Jersey, Members of U.S. Congress from New Jersey, and the press.

LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF NEW JERSEY,
VALENTINAS MELNINIS,

President.

ALBIN S. TRECIOKAS,

Secretary.

TARIFF COMMISSION DAIRY REPORT INCLUDES INSIGHT ON IMPORT SITUATION

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the last official acts performed by President Johnson was to restrict a number of areas of dairy imports. He implemented the recommendations of the majority of the members of the U.S. Tariff Commission, as listed in their report released January 10, 1969, but in the eyes of many dairy authorities, he overlooked the major problems of dairy imports today: The subsidized dumping of European dairy surpluses.

The argument against simply limiting the amounts of certain types of dairy imports has been most lucidly stated in the statement of Commissioner Penelope H. Thunberg in which Commissioner Bruce E. Clubb concurred.

Commissioner Thunberg points out that closing a door here or there simply means that the import effort will be directed to other areas.

For the reference of the Members, I include the statement in my remarks at this time:

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER THUNBERG IN WHICH COMMISSIONER CLUBB CONCURS

Mounting agricultural surpluses—including surpluses of dairy products—which are presently inundating the European Economic Community (EEC), buttressed by the Community's policy of subsidizing exports, make it clear that milk products from Europe can be landed in the United States at price levels substantially below those which have prevailed in this country in recent years. Pressures to minimize the costs of the Community's Common Agricultural Policy will, moreover, encourage the conversion of milk into any product which can be sold abroad for more than the cost of delivering it. In addition, excess dairy product output in the EEC has caused the accumulation of surpluses in other dairy-producing countries which formerly had exported sizable quantities to members of the Common Market. Exports of these three countries (primarily Denmark, Switzerland, Finland, and Austria), having been replaced by domestic output in the EEC, are increasingly seeking outlets in the high-priced U.S. market. The existence of this surplus milk production in Europe makes practically certain mounting imports of virtually all dairy products whose

entry into the United States is not subject to quantitative restrictions.

These facts—surplus production and subsidized exports abroad—combined with the near-term likelihood of continuing price rises in the United States clearly imply that an attempt to regulate only imports of low-priced cheese is futile. Permitting unrestricted entry to table-quality cheese priced higher than a stated minimum (e.g., higher than 37 or 47 cents per pound) will cause increased production and exports of this type of cheese from the surplus countries to the United States market. Other things being equal, as costs of U.S. dairy farmers continue to increase, present percentages of parity prices can be maintained only by raising U.S. support prices. With higher support prices imports would increasingly displace U.S. domestic production. Quite apart from the difficulties of administering such a price-determined quantitative restriction, therefore—and these administrative difficulties are many—relative price conditions are such that unrestricted imports of high-priced table-quality cheeses would be disruptive to domestic support programs. The requirements of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, therefore, make essential restrictions on all imports of dairy products—of products, that is, in which the cost of milk or butterfat represents a significant fraction of total cost.

An estimate of the amount of dairy products which could be imported into the United States without endangering the price-support program for milk is especially difficult both because of the many policy decisions required by law of the Secretary of Agriculture and the President in regard to prices, support levels, parity and production, and because of varying prices and agricultural policies abroad. Nonetheless a study of recent market trends suggests that imports in the range of one to one-and-a-quarter billion pounds (milk equivalent) could be absorbed with no further accumulation of Government stocks, given present levels of production, consumption and prices.¹

My recommendations for quantitative restrictions on imports of the dairy products under investigation, together with those restrictions already existing, aggregate approximately one billion pounds. Because U.S. price-support programs do not include milk other than cow's milk (such as sheep's milk or goat's milk), my estimate of aggregate im-

¹During the first part of the year 1966 at the then prevailing prices demand and supply relationships for dairy products in the United States appeared to be in approximate balance. Aggregate stocks, commercial and Government, appeared stable at about 4.5 billion pounds (milk equivalent); imports amounted to nearly one billion pounds at an annual rate.

During the preceding four years, 1962-65, total stocks held in the country had been steadily reduced from a level of 12 billion pounds in 1962. During the same period imports fluctuated around 850 million pounds annually, varying from 800 million in 1962 to 925 million in 1965. This was an interval of stability in parity levels at 75 percent with the CCC support objective for manufacturing milk rising gently from 3.11 cents per pound in 1962 to 3.24 cents in 1965. During these years the market price of butter at Chicago averaged 59 cents per pound.

On June 30, 1966, the CCC support price for milk for manufacturing was raised to 4 cents per pound, or 89.5 percent of parity from a level of 75 percent of parity that prevailed during the period 1962-65. The market price of butter at Chicago rose to 69 cents per pound; imports rose to a rate approaching 3 billion pounds a year and aggregate stocks began again to accumulate.

port capability is concerned with cow's milk and cow's milk products. My recommendations for quantitative restrictions consequently exclude products of milk other than cow's milk and are distributed among the categories under investigation in proportion to U.S. imports in 1965-67 (average) as shown in the accompanying table.² Because milk accounts for nearly 50 percent of the cost of producing chocolate crumb in the United States, I have included within the proposed quotas articles provided for in TSUS item 156.30 if containing over 5.5 percent by weight of butterfat (except articles which are ready to eat and are in retail packages of not over one pound net weight).

Because milk represents less than one quarter of the total cost of the chocolate and cocoa items covered by this investigation, other than chocolate crumb, I find no material interference, or practical certainty

thereof, with the support programs for milk and butterfat, and, therefore, make no recommendations for quantitative restrictions on such items.

On "aged" Cheddar cheese, I recommend continuation of the existing quantitative restriction of 1,225,000 pounds annually, with country allocations. On the edible preparations in bulk classifiable under TSUS item 182.92 (consisting largely of butterfat-sugar mixtures), I recommend continuation of the existing annual quota of 2,580,000 pounds and redefinition of the quota provision to include the same type products in retail-size containers (now entered under TSUS item 182.95) with no change in the amount of the quota.

The quantitative restrictions I recommend are shown in the following tabulation, which also shows the computations used in arriving at the recommended amounts:

Product (abbreviated description)	Average annual U.S. imports, 1965-67 (million pounds)	Milk equivalent of average imports		Factor used to convert product weight to milk equivalent (pounds)	Recommended quantitative restrictions	
		Quantity (million pounds)	Percent of total		Milk equivalent (million pounds)	Product weight (thousand pounds)
Condensed and evaporated milk and cream	3.5	8.0	2.2	2.20	8.7	3,935
Process Edam and Gouda cheeses	2.7	20.7	5.6	7.58	22.0	2,907
Italian-type cheeses not in original loaves	7.7	5.5	1.5	7.98	5.9	740
Swiss or Emmentaler cheese	13.2	111.9	30.0	8.49	118.0	13,904
Gruyere-process cheese	8.1	73.5	19.7	9.09	77.5	8,528
Certain "other" cheese (except cheese not containing cow's milk)	16.8	130.2	34.9	7.80	137.3	17,606
Chocolate crumb	10.0	22.8	6.1	2.30	24.0	10,436
Total	(1)	372.6	100.0	(1)	393.4	(1)

¹ Not meaningful.

I recommend that the quotas proposed in the tabulation be administered by means of a licensing system, such as that currently employed by the Department of Agriculture in administering quantitative restrictions on U.S. imports of most dairy products, so as to assure an equitable distribution of the quotas among importers, users, and supplying countries. To be equitable in the allocation of the quotas among supplying countries, the distribution of trade should, to the fullest extent practicable, reflect any special factors which may have affected or may be affecting the trade in the product in the representative period. Thus, in the case at hand, special consideration should be given to those countries which have not in recent years disrupted the domestic market—even though they possessed the capability of doing so—by restricting, or by not subsidizing, their exports to the United States. These countries should not now be penalized in the allocation of quotas because of their cooperation in such efforts. Rather, I suggest that the principles of Article XIII of the GATT be fully observed.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the free world this week is observing the 51st anniversary of Lithuanian independence

² For purposes of the 50-percent clause in the first proviso to section 22(b), the representative period for imports of the articles under investigation would thus become the calendar years 1965-67, inclusive.

with deep sympathy and admiration for those courageous people.

It was my honor to join yesterday with our esteemed colleague, the Honorable DANIEL FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, in paying tribute to Lithuania in the House of Representatives.

I am privileged today to call to the attention of Congress an eloquent resolution in commemoration of this historic event that was adopted at a mass meeting held by the Lithuanian people on February 16, 1969, at St. George's Hall, Newark, N.J. Mr. Albin S. Trečiokas, Secretary, Lithuanian Council of New Jersey, has kindly sent me the resolution which I am happy to insert at this point in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION OF LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF NEW JERSEY

Unanimously adopted at a meeting of American-Lithuanians and their friends living in New Jersey, sponsored by the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey, held on Sunday, February 16, 1969, at St. George's Lithuanian Hall, Newark, New Jersey, in commemoration of the 51st anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania by force in June of 1940; and

Whereas the Lithuanian people are strongly opposed to foreign domination and are determined to restore their freedom and sovereignty which they rightly and deservedly enjoyed for more than seven centuries in the past; and

Whereas the Soviets have deported or killed over twenty-five percent of the Lithuanian population since June 15, 1940; and

Whereas the House of Representatives and the United States Senate (of the 89th Congress) unanimously passed *House Concurrent Resolution 416* urging the President of the United States to direct the attention of

the world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian origin or decent, reaffirm our adherence to American democratic principles of government and pledge our support to our President and our Congress to achieve lasting peace, freedom and justice in the world; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States carried out the expression of the U.S. Congress contained in *H. Con. Res. 416* by bringing up the Baltic States question in the United Nations and demanding the Soviets to withdraw from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and be it further

Resolved, That the pauperization of the Lithuanian people, convention of once free farmers into serfs on kolkhozes and sovkhoses, as well as exploitation of workers, persecution of the faithful restriction of religious practices, and closing of houses of worship, and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded this day to the President of the United States, Secretary of State William Rogers, United States Ambassador to the United Nations Charles Yost, United States Senators from New Jersey, Members of U.S. Congress from New Jersey, and the press.

VALENTINAS MELINIS,
President.
ALBIN S. TREČIOKAS,
Secretary.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest in which over 400,000 students compete for five scholarships. Scholarships in the amounts of \$5,000, \$3,500, \$2,500, \$1,500, and \$1,000 are awarded to the winners in the contest, the theme of which this year was "Freedom's Challenge."

A winning contestant is chosen from each State and is brought to Washington for the final judging. The scholarship awards are announced at the VFW's annual congressional dinner, scheduled this year for March 4.

Mr. Speaker, Alabama's winner in the Voice of Democracy contest is Miss Patti Mungenast, 116 West Drive, Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., a resident of my congressional district. I commend Miss Mungenast for this accomplishment, and I wish her the best of luck in the national judging. I am inserting the text of Miss Mungenast's speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that other Members of Congress may benefit from reading the work of this fine young American:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Miss Patti Mungenast)

"This is your newscaster with the 12 o'clock report. Good afternoon. Today the world mourns the loss of the second Kennedy

brother. Robert F. Kennedy died early this morning after a struggle of nearly twelve hours. Doctors account for his death by a bullet which penetrated the skull causing the fatal wound. The Senator's body will be shipped to Arlington Cemetery, Wednesday, and will be laid next to his slain brother President John F. Kennedy who was assassinated four years ago.

"Meanwhile, FBI are still looking for James Earl Ray, accused assassin of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. King, shot and murdered three weeks ago, was the father of the Negro search for equal rights and was the principal character in forming resurrection city.

"In a moment we'll be back with more news after a word from our sponsor."

How often have we turned on our television sets only to hear something to this effect? Is this the United States? Is this the leader of the free world?

I don't think so. Too much emphasis today is placed on the riots and demonstrations and not enough on the good taking place around us. We live in a pessimistic society waiting impatiently for the H-Bomb to fall down upon us. We live on the evil printed in our newspapers and broadcasted on our T.V.'s. These are the things that are slowly tearing our nation apart.

This is freedom's challenge—to piece our country back together—to bind the wounds that prejudice and hatred have caused.

This challenge lies on the shoulders of each individual. John F. Kennedy in his Inaugural speech said, "Ask not what your country . . ." So many times people have asked "How can I do anything worthwhile for my country?" not realizing how much this nation depends upon these individuals themselves.

In the busy hustle and bustle of our twentieth century world, the individual seems to be lost. But he's not really. He's just hiding in the small communities. He may be a mayor or a PTA president. He may be a truck driver or a small business man. He may be a husband and he may be a father. He may be you.

But what makes him so very different? What makes him stand apart? It's all spelled out in a fourteen-letter word—Responsibility.

Our nation is a parasite. It thrives on you, the individual. Without you, it will wither and die; with you, we'll prosper and flourish.

We as students can only prepare ourselves for the future so that we may be able to support our country in action. To many, voting or obeying traffic laws may seem insignificant, but they are only a small part of a citizen's duty. We as Americans must ward off destruction to our democratic society and protect the love and respect for our country. Unfortunately, there aren't many people like this today.

You ask, "Is it too late? Has our time run out?"

One way to look at this is by viewing statistics. The average age of the world's greatest civilizations has been two hundred years.

These nations have (1) risen from slavery or bondage to a spiritual faith; (2) from spiritual faith to great courage; (3) from courage to liberty as did our own thirteen colonies; (4) from liberty we have grown into abundance; (5) from abundance to selfishness; (6) from selfishness to apathy; (7) from apathy to dependence; (8) from dependence back again to bondage.

In eight years our own United States will be two hundred years old. Will we, too, resort to selfishness and apathy?

It depends on you.

I was born 17 years ago, one in a long line of fourteen children, in Urbana, Illinois. Because my father is in the Air Force, I have had the opportunity of visiting many of the states and a few foreign countries such as Germany and Canada. These tours have given me an insight into other people's customs and I have gained many lasting friendships.

I arrived in Alabama three years ago and entered Montgomery Catholic High as a freshman. Since then I have had offices in Student Council, twice as president of my class. I hold an A-B average and speech, English, and history, are my favorite subjects. In my spare time I like to read and occasionally write poetry.

CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS REACH RECORD TOTAL

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, one of the few Government agencies which turns a profit while doing an extraordinarily competent job for the American people is the U.S. Customs Service, under the able leadership of Commissioner Lester D. Johnson. It is reassuring to know that we have within the executive branch of Government such a fine and dedicated group of public servants as those in the Bureau of Customs.

Even under the best conditions, Customs is a hard and thankless job, but we hear little about it. It is my pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues a press release issued recently by the Bureau of Customs on the occasion of its 180th birthday, reflecting some of the results of its hard work. It reads as follows:

CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS FOR 1968 BREAK ALL PREVIOUS RECORDS

A record total of \$3,179,762,090—an increase of 16.2% over the previous year—was collected by the Bureau of Customs during the calendar year ending December 31, U.S. Commissioner of Customs Lester D. Johnson announced today. It was the first time in its 180-year history that Customs revenues exceeded the three-billion-dollar mark.

Another record was broken by the number of persons entering the United States, including U.S. residents going abroad, foreign visitors, etc., and going through Customs processing. The total was greater than the entire population of the country—219,581,549 which represented a 4.8% increase over the 1967 total of 209,443,247.

Commissioner Johnson also reported substantial increases in the number of formal and informal customs entries of 13.8% and 14.9% respectively. Mail packages received rose from 54,351,384 to 58,068,349 (6.8%).

Reflecting the general upswing of business activity, customs invoices increased by 18.3% from 3,605,315 to 4,263,562.

Figures on aircraft arrivals rose by 9.6% from 298,848, to 327,456. Vehicles and trains, including freight cars, increased 4.3% from 62,159,768 to 64,826,836. Vessels and ferries rose 2.2%.

Commissioner Johnson said that the U.S. Customs Service, which is now in its 180th year of operations, has been able to absorb its soaring workload only with considerable difficulty in view of restraints on hiring which have applied during recent years.

"There appears no reason to believe," Mr. Johnson said, "that the Customs workload which is increasing more rapidly in some major instances than projected in our last budget estimate, will do anything but continue its upward spiral."

The Bureau of Customs has a wide range of responsibilities apart from collecting duty

on imports and processing travelers. It enforces statutes for about 40 other government agencies such as the Neutrality Act, the Export Control laws, anti-smuggling laws, etc.

For more than a century following its creation by the second, third and fifth acts of the First Congress in 1789, the Customs Service provided the federal government with most of its operating revenues. It financed the purchase of the Louisiana, Florida and the Alaska territories, and has played a key role in the development and expansion of the economy of the United States.

The ten collection districts, with each district designated by its headquarters port and showing the New York seaport and the New York Kennedy International Airport separately, having the largest total collections for calendar year 1968 were as follows:

Total customs collections, calendar year 1968

1. New York Seaport	\$939,620,702.71
2. Los Angeles	236,035,956.72
3. Detroit	226,716,550.79
4. New York Airport	192,846,974.17
5. Philadelphia	162,972,437.29
6. Chicago	153,200,463.59
7. San Francisco	138,713,523.05
8. Cleveland	134,398,639.49
9. Boston	118,326,591.43
10. Baltimore	92,684,109.94

Total customs collections, calendar year 1967

1. New York Seaport	\$816,419,067.00
2. Detroit	195,481,303.00
3. Los Angeles	190,665,083.00
4. New York Airport	162,830,529.00
5. Philadelphia	145,709,164.00
6. Chicago	135,020,365.00
7. San Francisco	115,177,606.00
8. Cleveland	110,502,860.00
9. Boston	109,782,947.00
10. Baltimore	78,235,640.00

HUNGER IN AMERICA—PART V

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times carries the fifth and last of a series of articles by Homer Bigart on the extent of hunger in the United States. In this article Mr. Bigart reports on the dire poverty and malnutrition which prevails in the hollows of Appalachia. Like his previous articles, this article should awaken the executive branch and the Congress to the need for immediate actions to make our agricultural abundance available to all of our people. This highly regarded journalist has rendered a signal service by focusing attention on these intolerable conditions which Government has a responsibility to wipe out. The article follows:

HUNGER IN AMERICA: APPALACHIA ILL-FED DESPITE A NATIONAL EFFORT

(By Homer Bigart)

PRESTONSBURG, Ky.—The hollows of Appalachia and their hidden nests of tar paper shacks are breeding another generation stunted by hunger and programmed for a lifetime of poverty.

Eight years have passed since President Kennedy focused the nation's attention on the hardships of thousands of unemployed miners and marginal farmers and their families existing in these mountains. Vast sums of Federal money have been poured into the

area. There has been a reduction in human misery. The miners no longer riot. But unemployment is heavy and poverty remains endemic.

When Senator Robert F. Kennedy visited this area a year ago, he found a county (Wolfe) where some 5,000 of the 6,500 residents lived below the poverty line—an income of \$3,000 a year for a family of four—and where half the total amount of food consumed was acquired through the Federal food stamp program. Today the reliance on Federal help has not diminished.

Here in eastern Kentucky as in the rural South, in the migrant farm labor camps of Florida, in the Mexican-American slums of San Antonio and in the Indian reservations of the Southwest a visitor hears this constant complaint: the Federal food programs, whether food stamps or direct distribution of surplus commodities, do not provide enough sustenance each month to stave off hunger.

The monthly allotment of food for a family usually runs out in the third week. People complain that the food stamps cost too much, although there is general agreement that the stamp program, in principle, is better than free distribution of commodities that often fail to meet nutritional requirements.

Persons eligible for stamps pay in "an amount equivalent to their normal expenditure for food," according to the plan, and then exchange the stamps, which are worth more than their pay-in value by varying amounts, for any food of their choice at groceries.

But the plan is unrealistic, Marian Wright Edelman, civil rights lawyer and counsel to last year's Poor People's March on Washington, explained in the capital, because despite some lowering of the buy-in scale, the assumption remains that people with little or no income need less to eat than people with more income. Families with no income—and there are many of them, she said—can hardly have a "normal expenditure for food."

Robert B. Choate, a transplanted Boston Brahmin who became a leading advocate in Washington for the hungry poor after a decade of philanthropic involvement with poverty programs in the Southwest, raised additional criticisms.

He noted that in Appalachia, fair distribution of food to the needy was impeded more by political and economic considerations than by racial bias. Here, as well as in much of the rest of rural America, most of the abject poor are not only white but Anglo-Saxon and Protestant as well. Of an estimated total of 12 million rural poor in the nation, he said, only three million were black.

ROLE OF COUNTY POLITICS

Mr. Choate said that welfare in Eastern Kentucky was often dominated by the county political machines, and a man's eligibility for food was conferred as a political favor.

He was not impressed by the Department of Agriculture's contention that all but 472 counties and independent cities in the United States were participating (or about to participate) in either the food stamp or the commodities program.

"Many counties," he charged, "have less than 10 per cent of their poor involved in the programs." (The latest Department of Agriculture figures—for November 1968—show 3,672,000 enrolled for commodities and 2,661,000 for food stamps, a total participation of 6,333,000. The department estimates that 8 to 10 million Americans are eligible.)

Recalling a trip through Eastern Kentucky last May, Mr. Choate said that fundamentalist preachers, who always thrive in areas of poverty, seemed to "condone" conditions of hunger, ignoring the mental and physical retardation that accompanies the phenomenon and dooms another generation to a life of deprivation.

A liberal Republican, Mr. Choate has been quietly urging friends in the Nixon Administration to drastically revise the handling of the food programs. He believes there may be as many as five million "chronically hungry" Americans and five to ten million more undernourished because of poverty-induced diets.

He would reduce the price of food stamps and expand the volume and variety of the free commodity distribution program to insure that every stomach got at least a minimum balanced intake. And while reluctant to join others who demand that the food programs be transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Choate conceded that the Agricultural Committees of Congress, dominated by conservatives and inclined to look upon the food programs as mechanisms for getting rid of surpluses and shoring up farm prices, showed little empathy for the poor.

Back in the hollows, meanwhile, the Appalachian Volunteers, an antipoverty organization, reported finding many mountaineers still ignorant of their rights to receive welfare payments and participate in the food programs. Rejected by the county officials in a first bid for welfare, the hungry parents would often return dejectedly to cabins swarming with children without first demanding a hearing.

During a tour of Floyd County hollows, when shanties perched precariously above the sulphur-polluted creeks, Hank Zingg, an Appalachian Volunteer, showed a visitor some families that had been refused relief because the father, an idle miner, was considered able-bodied.

In one cabin, Russell Johnson, 41, father of seven small children, produced a letter from a doctor saying that Mr. Johnson had silicosis, a disease of the lungs common among miners, induced by the inhalation of coal dust, and that "any type of exertion causes shortness of breath and smothering."

But Mr. Johnson said he had been turned down by the welfare board because he was not considered "totally and permanently disabled."

THREE DOLLARS RARELY AVAILABLE

His family's only income, he said, was the few dollars his wife earned keeping house for her grandfather. The family had to pay \$3 a month to obtain food stamps worth \$82, and because it rarely had \$3 available at one time the amount had to be provided by the food emergency fund of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Even so, the food seldom lasted into the third week, Mr. Johnson said.

"The rest of the month it's nothing but bread and gravy," he said.

And some families had to start watering the gravy during the fourth week.

"They're all puny but I never had no sickness out of 'em," declared Mrs. Milford Newsome, surveying some of her nine pallid children in a cabin beside a mine spur on the Ligon Branch. She was comparatively well-off, getting a total of \$309 a month from welfare and Social Security. But she had to pay out \$94 a month to obtain \$144 in stamps, she said, and the rent was \$15 a month plus light bills and the books for the seven children who were going to school.

She said the children received "free worm medicine" 18 months ago, thanks to a state demonstration anti-worm project, and she was getting free "blood pills" for anemia through Medicaid.

Up another hollow, two old ladies, one crippled by arthritis, the other ill with diabetes, said they had to drop out of the food stamp program because they could not afford to pay \$5 for transportation into Presburg.

EMERGENCY FOOD FUND

Last year Congress approved an emergency food and medical fund to be used by the O.E.O. for families who were too destitute to pay even 50 cents for food stamps or who had run out of stamps and were on the verge of starvation.

But the fund was inadequate.

At Whitesburg, Ky., Mrs. Irene Whittaker, coordinator of O.E.O.'s emergency program for Letcher, Leslie, Knott and Perry Counties, said that only about \$3,500 a month was available for emergency food supplement for the four counties, plus \$800 for medicine for diseases of malnutrition.

This monthly allocation was quickly exhausted, Mrs. Whittaker said, pointing out that one-third of the 95,000 residents of the four counties belonged to families with incomes of less than \$1,500 a year.

She could not say whether hunger was becoming more acute, but disclosed that during January, in Letcher County alone, 40 new families reported incomes of less than \$29 for the month, thus becoming eligible for the minimum (50 cents) pay-in for food stamps.

Mrs. Whittaker said she was troubled by the people she could not help. Some local observers said that her compassion was more the rule than the exception among the dispensers of welfare, that very few were callous although many were often made to appear insensitive because of the inadequacies and red tape of the programs.

Sometimes, even in the deep South, state and local officials are angels, they said. One who came to mind was William H. Burson, the 39-year-old State Welfare Director of Georgia.

Mr. Burson, a war correspondent with United Press International in Korea and a former aide to Senator Herman E. Talmadge, startled conservatives in the administration of Gov. Lester G. Maddox by vigorously attempting to install Federal food aid programs in every Georgian county, often over the opposition of county leaders.

In a telephone interview from Atlanta, Mr. Burson said that every county except Troup, a relatively high income area, was now on commodities or stamps. "Some of the other counties had denied any hunger existed," *** feed 'em they won't work."

Particularly troublesome was Glascock County. There, Mr. Burson recalled, Sheriff James English ran two welfare representatives out of the county, declaring that a food program would "just mean a lot of niggers lined up."

Eventually the Federal Department of Agriculture had to come in and set up a program, paying the administrative costs that the county had refused to pay, Mr. Burson said. But he had heard Glascock was reconsidering, and might cooperate on food stamps.

Elsewhere in the nation, local resistance to food programs seems to be softening. Nutritionists and social workers are discovering they can talk about the existence of hunger without being accused of giving aid and comfort to the Communists. They were helped by the publication in January of a preliminary report on a sampling of the United States Health Service's national nutrition survey, the first scientific attempt to measure malnutrition in America.

The report revealed an "alarming prevalence" of diseases associated with undernourished groups and was based on examinations of 12,000 persons selected at random in low-income areas of Texas, Louisiana, Kentucky and New York (but mostly in Texas and Louisiana).

Dr. Charles Upton Lowe, chairman of the Committee on Nutrition of the American Academy of Pediatrics and a member of a group that will interpret the ongoing survey, commented:

"This unambiguous and objective data documents scientifically that substantial malnutrition exists in the United States.

"We cannot tolerate malnutrition in this country."

Dr. Lowe is convinced that proper nutrition is the key to normal development of infants. He feels that the quality and quantity of nutrition given during the first two, three or four years of life may have the effect of "programming" the child for all the years of his life.

This country could wipe out malnutrition with an added expenditure of a billion dollars, Dr. Lowe said. He saw an "overlay of puritanism" in the opposition to adequate food programs, an opposition reflected, he thought, in the notion that "it's bad to give anything away."

But a billion dollars is insignificant, he said, compared with the social costs of abject poverty and hunger.

"Poverty is much more than a lack of cash," he said. "It is a way of life, all pervading, crushing, immobilizing, and destructive. It is self-perpetuating and infectious, spreading through regions like an infectious illness. And it is cruel, enervating, and dehumanizing."

Estimates of mental retardation among the impoverished were staggering," he said.

"Can anyone, Dr. Lowe demanded, measure the social cost of high infant mortality, high maternity death rate, prematurity, mental retardation, school dropouts and crime?"

LIBERALS LINKED TO COLLEGE RIOTS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I totally agree with the ranking member of the Education and Labor Committee that it is at best difficult to see the reasoning of those who would continue to finance the activities—through their education—of campus radicals with Federal funds.

Congresswoman GREEN has my support for legislation which would separate from Federal funds those students fomenting anarchy on our campuses.

Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., and Peter P. Muirhead have both criticized such legislation but Mrs. GREEN has spotlighted the problem. In a press report from the Baltimore Sun of February 19, Mrs. GREEN is quoted as saying that she is at a loss to understand the logic of those who would cut off Federal funds to school districts that do not obey Federal desegregation guidelines but oppose the same action against anarchists.

In addition, she has made a valid point that anarchists are encouraged by some within the liberal community.

At this point I insert the Baltimore Sun article and small article from the New York Daily News containing the comments of Dr. Allen on the same topic:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Feb. 19, 1969]

LIBERALS LINKED BY EDITH GREEN TO COLLEGE RIOTS

(By Alvin P. Sanoff)

ATLANTIC CITY, February 18.—Representative Edith Green (D. Ore.) accused campus

liberals today of encouraging the activities of student anarchists.

The ranking member of the House Committee on Education and Labor said that riots have been occurring "on colleges with the most liberal traditions" because "a large element of liberals have been going along with campus militants."

Mrs. Green charged that liberals who attacked Senator Barry Goldwater in his 1964 presidential campaign for his comment that "extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice," are now "doing and saying the same thing they criticized Goldwater for."

COHEN SCORED

The Oregon Democrat, who has spearheaded the passage of legislation calling for the cut-off of federal financial aid to students involved in campus riots, sharply criticized Wilbur J. Cohen, the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for his criticism of the legislation.

Mrs. Green said that when she hears Mr. Cohen "oppose the cut-off of funds to students participating in riots and at the same time support the cut-off of federal aid to school districts that do not obey federal desegregation guidelines," she is at a loss to understand his logic.

A somewhat different view of student protests was taken by Peter P. Muirhead, acting United States commissioner of education. Mr. Muirhead warned against "the all too easy solution of enacting laws that require universities to cut off federal aid to students who take part in campus protests."

THE ROOT OF UNREST

He said that any decision of depriving a student of federal aid "ought to be left to the institution itself."

Mr. Muirhead said that the root of campus unrest was the desire by students to have "an adequate say in determining what happens to them in our institutions of higher learning."

He said that "it is neither intelligent nor effective to try to reply to student protest simply and solely by repressing it."

Mr. Muirhead and Mrs. Green spoke before different groups here as part of the convention of the American Association of School Administrators.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Daily News, Feb. 14, 1969]

ALLEN RAPS CURB

ALBANY, February 13.—State Education Commissioner James E. Allen Jr., who will leave soon to become federal education commissioner, attacked today a state senate-passed bill that would withhold state financial aid to college students convicted of crimes on college campuses. "Scholarships and other forms of student aid are awarded as recognition of achievement and academic promise," Allen said. "They should not be used as a disciplinary measure." Allen said disciplining of disruptive students should be left to school and college authorities, "and when appropriate to civil action."

BEYOND THE PALE ON CAMPUS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is significant that the well known and widely read national columnist, Drew Pearson, is fed up with campus rioting. A recent Pearson column indicates his feelings in

this regard after visiting some 50 colleges and universities both inside and outside the United States.

I commend the reading of this column to all concerned with this continuing problem:

UNIVERSITIES SHOULD CRACK DOWN ON TROUBLEMAKERS—VIOLATE OTHERS RIGHTS

(By Drew Pearson)

CLARKSVILLE.—During the past 12 months, this writer has visited approximately 50 college campuses, ranging from the University of Warsaw in communist Poland and the Sorbonne in Paris to the University of Montana, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Florida, Washington State, MIT, Stout State College in Wisconsin and Austin Peay State College here in Tennessee. It has been a cross-section of colleges, large and small, and at all of the American institutions I have addressed student assemblies and conducted student forums.

From this experience I believe I can accurately report that American students generally are alert, dedicated and far ahead of previous generations in their desire to tackle the problems of the world. They are not interested primarily in becoming engineers, businessmen or insurance salesmen, as was my generation in college. The majority want to devote at least part of their lives to helping their fellow men. They are interested in the Peace Corps, Vista or going into government.

There was a day when the top graduates of the Harvard Law School were immediately gobbled up by the top Wall Street law firms. That day is over. These graduates and others from the best law schools are now more interested in spending some time in government or other productive community work. If they do sign up with big New York law firms, many specify that they must have time off to handle indigent clients or other community work.

MINORITY RULE

In contrast there is a minority in many colleges led by Negroes, which seems determined to disrupt education altogether. It has done so by reversing the American system of majority rule for a system of minority rule.

It has done this, moreover, by using a technique outlawed by American law and tradition—violence.

Minority rule by force and violence has almost paralyzed San Francisco State College, killed one college president, Dr. Courtney Smith of Swarthmore, and disrupted some of the most liberal institutions in America such as Brandeis, a Jewish university, the University of Chicago under liberal president Edward Levi, and the University of Wisconsin, long proud of its liberal LaFollette tradition. All have tried hard for several years to enlist more qualified Negro students, yet this is one of the demands of the Negro minority.

In each of the above institutions there has been a small minority of students which has used violence to sabotage education for the majority. In Swarthmore 40 black students locked themselves into the admission office and disrupted education for a thousand others. At Brandeis the ratio was about the same. At Chicago, 400 students tried to force their demands on the 9,000-student university by occupying the administration building. At Columbia, a university where I once taught, about 400 students tied up an institution of 30,000 also by occupying the administration building where they rifled the private papers of President Grayson Kirk.

TOUGHER TACTICS JUSTIFIED

My conclusions from having visited many campuses is that it is time for university authorities to realize they must provide edu-

education for the majority, not submit to disruption by the minority. Otherwise education in their strike-torn colleges will gradually erode. The easiest way to prevent disruption is to get back to previous disciplinary rules and expel violators immediately.

Today, in contrast with the past, striking students have been molly-coddled, given second and third chances and then allowed to remain in school. All of this puts a premium on violence.

Even the 400 who occupied Columbia's administration building and rifled the papers of President Kirk have been reinstated. And at San Francisco State, President S. I. Hayakawa, the toughest of the college administrators, has not suspended the original 639 strikers. He has only warned them that they will be suspended if arrested the second time.

This is unfair to the majority of the students who are trying to get an education; also unfair to the taxpayers who put up the money for education and to the alumni who help to finance private colleges.

San Francisco's minority band of student rioters should be given 90 days of cleaning the oil off Southern California's polluted beaches. There is ample law to cover this, both local law and federal law under the 1917 Sedition Act. College faculty members who want to put minority rule ahead of majority rule should also get the gate. There has been too much worry over the rights of minority disruptive faculty members and not enough concern over the rights of the majority.

In San Francisco State, only 350 teachers out of a total of 1,100 belong to Local 1352 of the American Federation of Teachers. And of these 350, only 200 wanted to strike. Yet this minority threw the entire campus into turmoil and got the backing of the San Francisco AFL-CIO Labor Council. This is something AFL-CIO President George Meany would hardly sanction—if he knew the facts.

What minority faculty members have got to realize is that alumni can strike too. So can majority students. Applicants at Columbia's last freshman class are down 21 per cent, in contrast to Harvard and Yale which had no riots and whose applicants are up 10 to 15 per cent. Students won't want to enroll at a university which may be riot-torn.

Any business firm which loses 21 per cent of its customers in one year is in danger of going out of business. Columbia can weather the slump. But it has been given a stiff reminder that the majority of students go to college to study, not to demonstrate.

More serious may be a Columbia alumni boycott in fund-giving. This is neither organized nor advertised, but it is a fact. If it spreads to other riot-torn campuses, it could be the most serious boycott of all.

CENSORSHIP—HIDING WHAT CANNOT BE DEFENDED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore-Washington Newspaper Guild—joined by the Washington AFL-CIO Central Labor Council—has announced a program of censorship over truth in news reporting.

To be precise, they have voted to condemn "the practice of stating irrelevant racial designations in crime stories." Why did they not include censorship of racial

designations by photographs and demand removal of racial designations from the so-called black programming pervading the entire communications media.

Nor can the proposals of these "book-burning" groups explain the blackout in reporting the trial of the terrorist accused of senselessly assaulting and murdering two unarmed, uniformed, U.S. Marine officers from nearby Quantico, Va., exercising their civil rights to buy hamburgers at a public eating establishment in our Nation's Capital.

The murder trial is now underway. Yet, last night there was but a small news item in section B of the paper. This morning and tonight there was no coverage. The same papers carried large reports of student protests and demonstrations to take over the educational institutions, teach Afro-American studies, and promote Swahili as a language.

Every effort to promote a belief in black accomplishment—but concerted efforts to conceal black destruction.

Likewise, we might remember the national public indignation that was heaped upon the American people from the news media over the murder of a uniformed Negro lieutenant colonel in Georgia.

Compare, also, the insignificant attention given the murder trial here in our Nation's Capital with the exposure given the American people over the murder trial in San Francisco and another trial in Memphis.

A young marine from my congressional district was murdered on the military reservation in North Carolina during a robbery. The racial designations of all involved parties were omitted. By whom and why? I ask: Did it accomplish anything when all knew what the racial designations were?

Truth can be temporarily concealed, but sooner or later the truth will out.

Mr. Speaker, I insert several news articles and releases following my remarks: [From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 15, 1969]

NEWS GUILD HITS LISTING BY RACE

The executive board of the Baltimore-Washington Newspaper Guild has voted to condemn "the practice of stressing irrelevant racial designations in crime stories" by daily newspapers.

The guild leaders, in unanimous action taken at a Wednesday meeting, particularly were critical of "deliberate racial orientation in selecting crime stories and identifying suspects."

The guild is the bargaining agent for most editorial and commercial employees of the three Washington daily newspapers. The board said it took action in recognition of its constitutional responsibility "To guarantee . . . constant honesty in the news (and) to raise the standards of journalism and ethics of the industry. . . ."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 20, 1969]

CLC JOINS GUILD IN RACIAL PROTEST

The Washington AFL-CIO Central Labor Council has joined the executive board of the Washington-Baltimore Newspaper Guild in condemning what the groups feel is a practice of stressing irrelevant racial designations in crime stories.

The guild, which represents editorial, ad-

vertising and clerical employees of most daily newspapers in the Washington-Baltimore area, passed a resolution last week condemning the practice.

The local guild is a member of the American Newspaper Guild, an AFL-CIO affiliate.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 19, 1969]

SURVIVING MARINE TELLS OF M STREET KILLING OF TWO (By Donald Hirzel)

A racial taunt led to the slaying of two young Marine officers and the wounding of a third in a Georgetown Little Tavern last June, the surviving Marine told a District Court jury yesterday.

Second Lt. Ellsworth R. Kramer, 26, of Arlington, was the first major witness to take the stand for the government in the trial before Judge Gerhard Gesell of Gordon Alexander, 27, of San Jose, Calif., and Benjamin Murdock, 20, of Los Angeles.

They are charged with the murders of Second Lts. William King Jr., 21, of Orlando, Fla., and Thaddeus Lesnick, 23, of Fishtail, Mont.

In addition, each is charged with four counts of assault with a dangerous weapon and one count of carrying a pistol without a license.

Kramer testified that he and four fellow Marines from Quantico, Va., and a girl entered the Little Tavern Restaurant, 3331 M St., NW, about 3 a.m. June 5. As they entered he noticed three men seated on stools at the counter.

The marines and the girl stood at the take-out counter near the door and ordered hamburgers and coffee.

Kramer said one of the seated men, later identified as Alexander, kept staring at him and he stared back. He said the three were dressed "eccentrically," explaining that they had African bush haircuts and goatees.

"Alexander looked at me steadily," Kramer said. "I returned the look. We stared at each other for an indefinite time."

He said Alexander may have found the white dress uniforms the Marines were wearing as eccentric as he found their appearances to be.

Kramer said he turned to the counter and felt a tap on his shoulder and turned around to face Alexander, who tapped Kramer's nameplate on his tunic and said: "Kramer, do you want to come outside and talk about it more? I'll turn you into a Little Red Riding Hood."

Kramer said he later learned the term "Little Red Riding Hood" meant that Alexander intended to "bloody me." Even though he did not know the term at the time, he said, he took it to be a threat.

At this moment, according to Kramer, King stepped to his side and said: "What do you goddamned niggers want?" Kramer said Alexander reached into his coat and pulled out a revolver, cocking it as he pointed it at arm's length at King. Kramer said Alexander replied, "I'll show you what I want."

Murdock, who had gone out the door with the third man who had been seated at the counter, returned at this moment and "then shooting began," Kramer said.

Kramer was not able to tell who fired the first shots, but William H. Collins Jr., an assistant U.S. attorney prosecuting the case, said in his opening statements that the government would attempt to show that only Murdock's weapon was used.

Kramer said he felt a "strike to the head" and fell with a scalp wound.

"As I was dropping to the deck (the floor) I looked to Murdock. He was in a crouch and was firing. . . ."

Kramer said Alexander and Murdock ran

out the door with Murdock still shooting. Kramer then tried to assist the two Marines who had been shot, he said. They were dead on arrival at the hospital.

Prosecutor Collins in his opening statement said the defendants were arrested a short time later in their car in the 3300 block of N Street NW. The third man in the restaurant with the defendants was Cornelius Frazier Jr., 23, also of San Jose, who originally was arrested on a murder charge but was never indicted.

The trial resumes today.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 5, 1968]

TWO SLAIN IN SHOOTING ON M STREET

Two young marine lieutenants were fatally shot and a third officer and a young woman were wounded early today in a burst of gunfire at a Georgetown hamburger shop.

Police arrested three men a block from the scene, the Little Tavern at 3331 M St. NW, and charged them with homicide. The three, all Negroes, gave California addresses.

One told police he had come to Washington late last week to join the Poor People's Campaign. He told police he was living in a 14th Street apartment and not at Resurrection City.

POLICE LIST NAMES

Police listed the dead officers as Lt. William King, 21, and Lt. Thaddeus Lesnick, about 20, who had come to Washington with three other officers late last night after a social function at the marine base at Quantico, Va.

The wounded man, police said, is Lt. Ellsworth R. Kramer, 26, who suffered a scalp wound. The young woman with him, Barbara Kelly, 28, of the 1800 block of Metzgerott Road, Adelphi, Md., was shot in the hip.

All the victims are white.

Charged with homicide are Gordon Alexander, 27, and Cornelius Frazier Jr., 23, both of San Jose, Calif., and Benjamin Murdock, 20, of Los Angeles.

The other two lieutenants from Quantico were identified by police as Daniel LeGear Jr., 26, and Frank R. Marasco, 23.

According to police, the five officers came to Washington still in their dress white uniforms, visited a Georgetown night spot and called on some friends.

Finally the five, accompanied by Miss Kelly, went to the hamburger shop and were at the counter when some words were exchanged with three men after one of them made a remark about the name of one of the Marine officers, displayed on his uniform, police said.

POLICE CONVERGE ON AREA

The three civilians left, but returned in a matter of minutes and shooting began, police said. Police said they later recovered two guns. One witness reported that nine shots were fired.

Police converged on the area after the shooting, which took place about 3 a.m. Pvt. Junior Webster, alone in a scout car, said he heard the shots and took off after a Mustang racing from the scene and captured the three suspects.

Lesnick was pronounced dead at 3:15 a.m. at George Washington University Hospital, and King at 3:50 a.m. at Georgetown University Hospital.

Kramer was taken to the GWU hospital and later moved to Bethesda Naval Hospital where his condition was called satisfactory. Miss Kelly was in the GU hospital also in satisfactory condition.

Police identified Alexander as the suspect who said he had come here to join the Poor People's Campaign. They quoted him as saying he did not come East with the other two suspects but became acquainted with them here.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) State-Times, Nov. 28, 1968]

THREE ARE HELD IN PROBE OF BR MARINE'S DEATH

CAMP LEJEUNE, N.C.—Three men, reported to be Marines, are being held in connection with the fatal beating of Pvt. Thomas L. Morrow III, 26, Baton Rouge, a spokesman at Camp LeJeune said yesterday.

Names of the three suspects were being withheld pending further investigation.

Morrow, son of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Lindsey Morrow of 2024 Cloverdale and a graduate of Baton Rouge High School, was attacked on the base last Thursday night and died shortly after midnight Monday.

A base spokesman said Morrow suffered a fractured skull in the attack, which occurred in the Montford Point area of the base. Robbery was thought to have been the motive.

The young marine had been beaten and robbed on the base last Thursday night while he was walking back to his barracks. He was hospitalized at the U.S. Naval Hospital at Camp LeJeune.

Morrow was a student in the Marines' service support school training to work in the Corps' disbursement section, the information officer said.

The death is under investigation by the provost marshal at the camp. No affirmative results have been reported so far, the officer said.

Morrow's parents were at his bedside over the weekend.

They were returning to Baton Rouge this afternoon.

A graduate of Baton Rouge High School, Morrow, 26, received a bachelor's degree in wildlife and forestry from LSU in 1964. This June he received a master's degree in wildlife management from Colorado State University.

He graduated with honors from both universities and received numerous academic awards while he was a student.

He was with the Peace Corps briefly before joining the Marines. Morrow received his basic training in California and had been transferred to Camp LeJeune shortly before the fatal beating.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) State-Times, Feb. 10, 1969]

LOCAL MARINE'S SLAYER IS METED 15-YEAR SENTENCE

JACKSONVILLE, N.C.—A Camp LeJeune Marine court martial board Friday convicted Pfc. Clarence E. Johnson, 20, of Kansas City, Mo., of murder and larceny in the slaying of another Marine from Louisiana.

Johnson was sentenced to 15 years at hard labor, dishonorable discharge, reduction in rank to enlisted man, and forfeiture of pay. The maximum penalty would have been life imprisonment.

He had been charged with murder and robbery in the death on the post of Pvt. T. L. Morrow, 26, of Baton Rouge, La.

Johnson's lawyer said he would ask the 10 members of the general court martial board to recommend clemency—a reduction of the sentence. Three-fourths of the board, or eight members, would have to assent. Johnson also can appeal through military channels.

Johnson and two other Marines were originally charged in the case. One of them, Pfc. Adam L. Vanlandingham, 18, of Baltimore, was acquitted of a murder charge last Friday. But he was convicted of larceny and sentenced to a bad conduct discharge and six months at hard labor.

Witnesses at the Vanlandingham trial testified that Morrow was knocked to the ground by another marine, kicked in the head, and robbed of \$60.

The third original defendant, Pfc. Harold

McDonald, whose address was unavailable, had been charged only with robbery. This charge was dropped Wednesday, the day Johnson's court martial opened.

AIR ACCESS TO OUR CITIES

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned with aviation safety and also the impact of aviation upon life in the environs of our airports. I shall continue to be concerned with these matters. But I am also concerned with another aspect of aviation—its importance in keeping our great cities easily accessible to the business and tourist traveler.

Continued lack of adequate airports and airways facilities will have an adverse economic impact on some of this country's most important centers of commerce and trade. Nowhere is this more evident than in New York City which, through easy access by air, has become the world's richest gateway.

In a recent article in the New York Times, Richard Phalon reported on the unfavorable economic impact continued airports-airways congestion will have on the New York area. While New York may have the most to lose in this regard, other major U.S. cities face similar unfavorable economic consequences unless adequate airports and airways systems are provided nationwide. Therefore, I believe Mr. Phalon's article may be of interest to my colleagues from other cities. Under the leave to extend my remarks, I submit it for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 16, 1969]
EFFECT OF AIRPORT DELAY ON CITY ECONOMY WORRIES MANY—DOMESTIC PASSENGER TRAFFIC AT KENNEDY SHOWS FIRST DIP

(By Richard Phalon)

Congestion and delay at the major airports here have so far had only a limited effect on the city's business life and tourist trade, but there are signs that passenger traffic is beginning a shift from New York that could have serious economic consequences.

Some of the indications of the trouble in the future are:

Domestic passenger traffic at Kennedy International Airport declined last year for the first time in the airport's 20-year history. The number of international travelers at Kennedy grew by 10 per cent, while passenger traffic in the nation as a whole continued to expand at a level of almost 13 per cent.

Some travel agencies in other sections of the country are becoming increasingly reluctant to ticket their clients through the once-traditional gateway of New York on their way to Europe. A Chicago agency, the Trans Continental Travel Bureau, for example, urges customers to fly abroad directly from that city or connect with international flights in Montreal or Toronto.

The Ford Motor Company has suggested to its thousands of employees that they avoid using Kennedy Airport on domestic trips wherever possible. The company is already

booking trips that detour around New York on employees on foreign assignments.

The Federal Government has begun taking "remedial" measures against New York's air congestion that may accelerate the by-passing of the city by commercial airlines.

NEW YORK SKIPPED

The Civil Aeronautics Board, for instance, recently authorized Northeast Airlines to open a new route between New England and five cities in the middle West, with the proviso that flights skip New York to avoid the bottleneck here.

The agency is currently considering establishing direct routes between Europe and half a dozen East Coast cities whose residents frequently fly here to board international flights.

In an attempt to tackle the immediate congestion problem, the Federal Aviation Administration has made plans to curtail sharply the use of the major airports here and in Washington and Chicago, starting April 27, by limiting the flights that will be allowed each hour in periods of poor visibility.

The Nixon Administration has ordered a restudy of this plan. But the alternatives may be to permit congestion to develop much as it did at the height of last summer's travel season, or limit the expansion of the major fields here and in the other two cities affected.

The delays became a nightmare last summer for tens of thousands of air travelers as peak demand saturated airport capacity and air traffic controllers began spacing air traffic "by the book" as part of their campaign to force improvement of the air traffic system.

It became routine for planes to arrive two or three hours late because of congestion-produced aerial stacking and long queues on the ground.

FLIGHTS DIVERTED

Some of the drop in Kennedy's domestic passenger traffic last year reflected the diversion of flights to La Guardia and Newark Airports because of the congestion. The shift indicates that Kennedy is "bumping much closer to saturation" than the other two airports, a Port of New York Authority spokesman said.

Some observers fear that the inevitable leveling off of the growth curve at the airports here may be portending a serious loss in the city's \$1.5-billion annual tourist trade. "There are no numbers to prove it," says John R. Wiley, director of aviation for the Port Authority, which runs the airports, "but it's my impression that we just aren't getting as many people bound overseas stopping over in New York to see the shows and do some visiting as we used to."

Ben Emden, executive secretary of the Restaurant League of New York, said, "Anything that fouls up air traffic or disrupts easy access to the city disrupts our business."

Easy access by air is one of the factors that has made New York the world's richest gateway. It is also one of the considerations that has led many of the nation's big corporations to make their headquarters here.

Projections made last year by the Regional Plan Association indicate that white-collar work holds the biggest growth potential for the metropolitan area's job market, and airport congestion could affect that potential by making the city less attractive for businesses.

The slowdown in the growth rate of international air travel here cannot be blamed solely on traffic problems. No city could long keep a hold on the commercial aviation market.

An effort is being made to improve the situation. In the last 20 years the Port Authority has put more than \$600-million into the three major airports. Additional millions are being invested by the authority and the air-

lines to expand Kennedy, La Guardia and Newark for the era of jumbo jets and supersonic jetliners.

Almost all segments of the industry, however, including the Port Authority and the Federal Aviation Administration, have underestimated the growth rate for both commercial and general aviation.

Plans for a fourth jetport have been stymied by community objections, and the F.A.A. has been slow to push for more efficient control equipment. The result, particularly in bad weather, has been congestion, with too many planes bidding for too little space.

The competition—Chicago, Philadelphia and Montreal—has been quick to respond. Thus, from a near monopoly in the piston-driven days after World War II, New York's share of trans-Atlantic travel fell to 82 per cent in 1963, to 80 per cent in 1965, and to 77 per cent last year.

NEW JETPORT CALLED KEY

Mr. Wiley, who has been in the van of the Port Authority's efforts to establish a fourth jetport, said that "with additional airport capacity we need not be losing market position at all."

Constantine Sidamon-Eristoff, the city Transportation Administrator, makes much the same point. "When you're locked in and can't expand," he said, "there's nowhere to go but down. In this economy if you stand still, you lose ground."

The region has a lot to lose. The 55,000 people who work at the Port Authority airports earn \$500-million a year, and this does not include payrolls on the \$400-million in construction planned over the next several years.

Perhaps the most striking example of how much air access means to the city's economy emerged two years ago when a strike by the International Association of Machinists shut down five domestic airlines for seven weeks at the peak of the summer tourist season.

Reservations at 34 of the city's biggest hotels declined 1,500 rooms a day and retail sales fell by almost \$20-million during the period.

There were labor problems in the background again last summer when the F.A.A. flight controllers, in a demand for more help and better equipment, began running flight separations "by the book." The slowdown, coupled with the big vacation push, resulted in jamups that eddied all over the country.

HOTELS LOSE BUSINESS

Hotel occupancy rates here declined somewhat. How much of the dip was due to national publicity over the condition of the city's air space and how much of it was due to the tourists' concern over the possibility of summertime disorders in the city's streets could not be determined. Both were factors in a combined squeeze that probably cost the city's tourist trade more than \$1-million a day.

Thus far there has been no attrition the city's traditional function as the nation's "front office."

Leased office space increased by two million square feet here in the first 11 months of last year, and one out of every three of the nation's 500 biggest corporations call the New York metropolitan area home, a concentration unequalled in any other part of the country.

They do so for many reasons, not the least of which is efficient air transportation.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 16, 1969]

EXPERTS PROPOSE WAYS TO EASE AIR CONGESTION

Development of STOL ports for short-range aircraft, additional runways for long-range flights and a system of satellite airports for

private craft could help to ease air congestion here—even if a fourth jetport never materializes.

What would it cost the city if none of those steps is taken and Kennedy, La Guardia and Newark Airports reach complete saturation? About \$200-million a year by 1975, according to R. Dixon Speas Associates. The management consultants, who specialize in airline problems, base the figure on current growth rates.

They estimate that the two airports will lose about 3.8-million passengers because of inadequate facilities. The bulk of the potential loss—\$162-million—is in airline airport-employee wages; the balance in tourist spending.

ZURICH ATTACK

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, this week's commando raid on an El Al airliner should provide us with incontrovertible evidence as to who is trying to plunge the Middle East into a new, more terrible war.

I was encouraged by the State Department's announced concern Wednesday that the attack represented "a grave threat to life and safety" and their reported interest in "prompt international efforts to safeguard air commerce against all acts of unlawful interference."

Is that enough?

Let us not forget that these marauders are so unresponsive to international sentiment that they chose to launch their attack in Zurich, Switzerland, that haven, traditionally neutral even in Europe's darkest hours.

Let us remember they attack life, not equipment. Six persons on that Boeing 707 plane from Amsterdam to Tel Aviv were wounded.

Let us note that the plane carried an American citizen, Dr. Marvin Bacher, who has said that were it not for the quick and courageous response of an Israeli security guard, some on the plane would have been killed.

We should take note that the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, a Marxist organization based in Amman, Jordan, boasted of the attack and proudly took credit for it.

We should remember that the weapons used were Russian-made Kalashnikov submachineguns.

And finally we should not forget who our friends have been.

Can we still ask who is the aggressor, who attacks women and children, who interdicts international commerce, who seeks war not peace?

I include two telegrams I received this morning:

TELEGRAMS

We were horrified—but not surprised—by the latest expression of international gangsterism against the El Al plane in Zurich. Once again, the lives of innocent travelers were placed in jeopardy and Israel's international air links threatened. Even United Na-

tions Secretary General U Thant has warned that civil aviation is threatened with chaos and anarchy.

The responsibility for this act clearly lies with the Arab governments. Every civilized government has the responsibility to do all in its power to stop international murderers from operating from its soil. But Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iraq and Lebanon, to the contrary, have encouraged the terrorists, financed them and armed them.

Only this past week, President Nasser of Egypt enthusiastically praised the terrorist organizations and promised continued support. And only yesterday, King Hussein of Jordan met with the leader of El Fatah to give his encouragement. Indeed, the announcement of the murderous attack in Zurich was made from Amman, Jordan.

Rather than preventing such terrorism, the United Nations Security Council's one-sided condemnation of Israel last Dec. 31 had the effect of encouraging Arab terrorists in the belief that they are immune from international censure. This most recent attack is another consequence of that unevenhanded action.

The act of the Security Council was predictable in that six of its members have no diplomatic relations with Israel and one permanent member, the Soviet Union, has consistently exercised its veto to protect its Arab clients from condemnation for 20 years.

Nevertheless, we urge the United States Government to give leadership to secure unambiguous action from the United Nations to put responsibility for these acts of terror where they belong—upon the Arab governments nurturing the terrorist movements.

If the United Nations fails to take prompt action, then it should be incumbent upon the United States and other nations to halt acts of terrorism against all civilian air carriers through all appropriate measures, which could include the boycott of air travel to those countries which refuse to take steps to control terrorists based on their soil and operating with their consent and encouragement.

THEODORE R. MANN,
President, Jewish Community Relations
Council of Greater Philadelphia.

The latest act of terrorism by the Arab world is tragic both in its results and implications. Not only were the lives of innocent men and women once again threatened by such irresponsible acts, but the freedom to travel of the entire world is at stake if such terror tactics are permitted to go unchallenged and unchecked. Israel was condemned by the United Nations for responding to a similar attack in Athens and this action apparently is interpreted as protection for further such outrageous deeds as is shown in the experience in Zurich.

It is idle to debate where the responsibility and blame must lie. The Arab countries can put a stop to this threat to world security if they wish to do so. On the contrary, they gloat publicly over these brutal experiences and proclaim their pride rather than their blame.

We join with others in urging the United States Government to take the lead in securing international condemnation for these repeated acts against innocent lives and against the rights of all people to travel freely on peaceful missions. It is our belief that all countries should join not only in deploring these tragic incidents but in banning the use of their airports by those countries which by their very acts challenge the security of all nations.

We earnestly beseech your personal efforts to place the responsibility where it belongs to condemn these acts of violence

and to assure the security of civil aviation around the world.

SYLVAN M. COHEN,
President.
DONALD B. HURWITZ,
Vice President, Executive Director, Federation of Jewish Agencies of Greater Philadelphia.

MINNESOTA WINNER: FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it is reassuring to know that not all of America's students advocate revolution and the destruction of the "establishment." I believe that the vast majority of our young people recognize and appreciate the values in our society, but they are not as vocal or demonstrative as their counterparts on the extreme fringes.

Miss JoAnne Sigurdson, of Albert Lea, Minn., prepared the prize-winning speech in the Minnesota Division of the Veterans of Foreign Wars contest. The theme this year is "Freedom's Challenge." Miss Sigurdson has pinpointed the challenges and the opportunities afforded today's youth. Her approach is a rational, constructive one which I commend to all of our youth who may be searching for answers to the meaning of life for themselves in today's society. I further commend the reading of this speech to my colleagues and insert at this point in the RECORD:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

I dare you! How many times have you heard someone say that phrase? I am sure most everyone has heard it sometime or other. To dare is to challenge. It is, indeed, a great challenge to meet the responsibilities of a teenager in today's changing world. Therefore, I dare myself as a teenager to accept Freedom's challenge of becoming a good responsible citizen of this wonderful country of which I am very definitely a part. Certainly my greatest responsibility is to be a good American citizen.

The word responsible is defined as able and ready to meet obligations, and responsibilities is defined as duty or trust. We are all responsible for doing our share to keep our country great and strong, so it would be wise, first, to acquaint ourselves with the ideals upon which our nation is founded. In order to do this, there are some qualities that we should try to develop as early in life as possible, such as: good leadership, cooperation and self control, good sportsmanship, to be understanding, honest, and to learn to give and take, also, practice persistency and determination. All of these can be accomplished if we try.

Education is essential. I am very fortunate that I live in a country that is dedicated to learning. It is my responsibility to get all the education I can. The opportunities offered in this area are unlimited. I can learn much by keeping myself informed about what is going on. In addition to our schools, a great deal could be learned by watching and listening to our teachers and leaders of today. Strive to be an informed citizen and know what is going on in our local and state governments. We cannot successfully be a part

of something of which we know nothing, so participation in public affairs and local events is not only necessary, but it is a great experience. We learn by doing, and experience is a great teacher.

We are free to select our own reading material. Reading of good books should be encouraged. Those not read are more apt to succeed.

It is important that we all enjoy and make use of our religious freedom, and it is imperative that we also have some Christian education as well. The churches also have many institutions of higher learning, and it encourages its youth to attend them. It is good to get a healthy and holy attitude toward life in our early years. I firmly believe that an education with some Christian background helps us to be more unselfish and to perhaps understand ourselves better.

It is sometimes believed that most of the followers of the so called hippies and the drug users do so because of a lack of understanding and wanting to find themselves. There certainly are other ways of understanding ourselves than through the use of LSD. We are also free to select our friends. It is important to select good friends and seek clean wholesome entertainment. Fellowship together building character and personality. A group of teenagers gathered together does not have to mean trouble. The responsibility for good behavior lies squarely on our own shoulders. If we keep ourselves busy doing something constructive, we won't find ourselves doing something destructive. It is true a teenager likes to be independent, but, at the same time, it is not necessary to let our growing independence become a stumbling block. We can learn to express our opinions in such a way so as to be heard with respect, not with protests or demonstrations such as we read about in our daily newspapers.

It is generally regarded that maybe our forefathers did not have so much to protest about. I disagreed wholeheartedly. It's true, we live in a changing world, but remember, it was a changing world for them, too. When our parents were teenagers they had many of the same problems we do today, such as money, jobs, entertainment, yes and even love. It is very important that we learn to respect our parents. Get to know them and socialize with them. Believe it or not, it is possible to have fun with your mom and dad. It's a lot easier to talk things over with them and get their advice and help if you are on a friendly basis with them, and even though we sometimes think it's hard to understand parents at times, it must be just as hard for them to understand us at times, too. Freedom of speech is meant for parents as well, so we should listen to them. Even though our friends are always available for advice, we must realize that they usually just agree with our way of thinking. Boys and girls should get to know their parents before they start to break away from their dependency.

Another freedom we enjoy is the privilege of choosing our own careers. After studying our talents and interests to find what is best suited for us, we should make up our mind what we want to do and stay with it. Be persistent and determined. Set a high standard and then try to attain it even though it may be too high to reach. We will still improve our standards by having to reach upward. Let the type of education you receive serve as your launching pad from which to move out and upward toward the goal you have selected for yourself. This will not only benefit the person working to reach his goal but will also aid in the welfare of his community. One person can do a lot. Be a good model. Prepare yourself today for your future tomorrows. We are the future generation.

With all the challenges of the freedoms of today, there are many gates left open, beckoning us to enter. We must be careful not to take the road that leads to a dead end.

FEDERAL EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL SALARY REFORMS OF 1969

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, many concerned citizens have been asking why it was necessary to increase congressional salaries at this time. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Compensation and author of the plan which resulted in these salary increases, I want to make clear that this action by the Executive in effecting increases for Federal executives, judges, and Members of Congress represented a giant step forward in Federal personnel management.

For the benefit of my colleagues, who have asked for further background on this question, I have prepared an analysis which, without objection, I will insert in the RECORD at this point.

In addition, I want to call my colleagues' attention to two editorials which shed further light on the need for these salary reforms. I will insert them at the conclusion of my analysis.

The material referred to follows:

FEDERAL EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL SALARY REFORMS OF 1969

(An analysis by Representative MORRIS K. UDALL, chairman, Subcommittee on Compensation, U.S. House of Representatives)

Why was it necessary to increase the salaries of Members of Congress in 1969, just four years after a pay increase that met with considerable public criticism? Why was it necessary to go to \$42,500, an increase of nearly 42 percent? Why were huge increases necessary for cabinet officers and Supreme Court judges? How can such increases be justified when the country is being asked to tighten its belt to hold inflation in check?

Questions like these are being asked by people who see these recent pay increases as a kind of betrayal of public trust. But those familiar with the history of Federal executive, legislative and judicial salaries know that this was *not* the case. In fact, the recommendations of the Quadrennial Commission, established by Congress to study these top-level salaries, gained the support, with some downward revisions, of both the outgoing Johnson Administration and the incoming Nixon Administration. They had the support of the leaders of both parties in the Congress. They were strongly endorsed by the American Bar Association, all the major Federal employee organizations, and innumerable leaders of private industry throughout the country. They were the result of a procedure set up by act of Congress two years ago to take such management decisions *out of the hands of Congress* and to institute some resemblance of rationality into a salary system which heretofore has been a hodgepodge of politics, folklore and mysticism.

THE BASIC PROBLEM

Congress in 1962 established a regular, orderly procedure for determining the pay of the vast majority of Federal employees. This procedure attempts to make the pay of each Federal employee *comparable* to the pay of people doing the same type of work

in private industry. With passage of the Postal Revenue and Federal Salary Act of 1967 Congress, for the first time, made this policy a reality by voting a three-stage increase for all Federal workers, closing the "comparability gap" which had existed in most classifications. That act would have been a farce, however, if provision had not been made to adjust the salaries of those officials whose level of compensation constitutes an absolute ceiling on the classified service. If the comparability system was to be rational, to work at all levels of the classified Federal service, some means had to be found to provide for the same kind of regular, orderly adjustment of this "ceiling" as changes were made in the pay structure of the classified system as a whole.

The answer to this problem took the form of a provision in that 1967 pay act creating a Commission on Executive, Legislative and Judicial Salaries, to be formed every four years for a review of these upper-echelon jobs in the Federal service. Basically, the jobs involved are those of cabinet and sub-cabinet officials appointed by the President, of all Federal judges, and of Members of Congress. Significantly, it is only the congressional salaries which have prompted any great criticism or received any attention from the press.

Last year President Johnson appointed the first Quadrennial Commission to make a study of salaries in these areas of government. Its chairman was Frederick R. Kappel, retired Chairman of the Board of American Telephone and Telegraph Co. Other members were George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO; John J. Corson, consultant and corporate director; Stephen K. Bailey, dean of the Maxwell Graduate School at Syracuse University; Sidney J. Weinberg, senior partner of Goldman, Sachs and Co., investment bankers; Edward H. Foley, former Undersecretary of the Treasury; William Spoelhof, president of Calvin College; Arthur H. Dean, partner in the prominent law firm, Sullivan and Cromwell; and William T. Gossett, president of the American Bar Association.

After a thorough study of salaries paid executives in all levels of government and in private industry, the Kappel Commission made a report to the President drawing this conclusion concerning the rates of pay then designated for the officers holding the highest responsibility in our Federal government:

"The conclusion to us is inescapable that present salary levels are not commensurate with the importance of the positions held. They are not sufficient to support a standard of living that individuals qualified for such posts can fairly expect to enjoy and in many instances have established. We should expect the compensation of those to whom we entrust high responsibilities and authority in government to bear some reasonable relationship to that received by their peers in private life. This expectation, however, is not now met."

As a result of its study, and in keeping with its responsibility as set forth in the 1967 pay act, the Commission recommended new salary levels for each of the categories covered. It proposed that cabinet officers be paid \$60,000, Supreme Court justices \$65,000, Members of Congress \$50,000, and other officers lesser amounts in keeping with the relative responsibility of their jobs.

Under provisions of law those recommendations could be accepted or scaled down, but not increased, by the President. In his message of January 17, 1969, President Johnson recommended implementation of nearly all of the Commission's proposals *except* that for Members of Congress. On the advice of many in Congress who objected to the amount of the increase proposed for them, the President chose to reduce that figure to \$42,500.

Once submitted by the President, the new salary schedule would become law within 30 days unless one house of Congress acted

first on a resolution of disapproval. Fortunately, such disapproval was *not* voted, and the new schedule *did* become law.

As the author of the Quadrennial Commission approach to the thorny problem of executive, legislative and judicial salaries, I believe we have now taken this issue out of the arena of political posturing and introduced an element of rational management into the Federal pay structure. Henceforth, Members of Congress will not be put in the preposterous position of having the sole responsibility for fixing their own salaries. I trust we will never return to such a system. I believe it is a sound principle of government that no public official should be permitted or asked to be the judge in his own case.

THE PROBLEM OF EXECUTIVE RECRUITMENT

I'm sure there is no argument about the importance of filling the top jobs in government with the best qualified public servants available. You wouldn't take a file clerk, a mechanic or a Social Security pensioner and make him president of a giant corporation, meanwhile asking him to remain at his old pay level. Yet that is precisely what many unthinking citizens seem to suggest when they equate the pay of a cabinet officer or congressman with their own level of compensation. In truth, the irrational pay structure in the upper levels of the Federal government has deprived us of the services of many of the best qualified managers and administrators our country has to offer. Of course, it's almost always possible to find someone to fill a job; that's not the issue. The issue is whether we can get the *best* man for the job.

In the course of the last eight years I have been interested to read the criticisms leveled against pay increases for government executives by certain press organizations whose own executives are in the over-\$100,000 category. In truth, there isn't a major city in the United States which lacks executives in its local government, its school systems, its public utilities and private corporations making substantially more than we have been paying the Secretary of Defense, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and other government officials right up to the present moment.

In order to recruit and retain the kind of people who can manage the Federal establishment as it *ought* to be managed there has to be some proximity between private industry salaries and those in the Federal government. This is especially true of sub-cabinet people, whose jobs lack the glamor, the publicity and the prominence of cabinet posts. Very few men are willing to take a cut of 50% or 75% in salary in order to render essentially anonymous service, yet that is what we have been asking our sub-cabinet people to do.

In the judgment of those men—in both parties—who have had to wrestle with the problem of executive recruitment the Nixon Administration would have had a very difficult time recruiting good men for its upper-level administrative jobs if these pay increases had not taken effect.

It's important to note, also, that under the procedure established in the 1967 pay act there could be no revision of the schedule submitted by the President. Congressmen couldn't have reduced their pay increase and left the cabinet and sub-cabinet pay proposals intact; the only options were accepting or rejecting the total package. Rejecting it might have been politically popular for congressmen sensitive about their own salary increases, but it would have been a disaster to the Nixon Administration in its recruiting efforts.

THE PROBLEM OF COMPRESSION

Through the years the Congress has always refused to assign salaries to sub-cabinet personnel higher than those paid Mem-

bers of Congress. This is understandable, since obviously an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, for example, carries no more responsibility than a senator or congressman—if as much. However, unwillingness of the Congress to raise congressional salaries has created a whole chain of problems:

It has made recruitment of sub-cabinet personnel difficult.

It has made commonplace the situation in which the head of an important agency, having major responsibility, finds himself being paid essentially the same salary as several of his subordinates having only a fraction of that responsibility.

It has denied to career public servants in the top grades of the classified service the salary increases they would otherwise receive through the comparability mechanism established by Congress. For example, one career executive I know, a veteran of 23 years of Federal service, classified as G.S. 18, has been held to a salary of \$28,000, even though the full rate of pay for his job ought to be \$30,239. Now, thanks to the actions of the Kappel Commission and the President, that ceiling has been removed, and he will start receiving his full pay for the first time.

For all of these reasons it was necessary, from the standpoint of good, sound business management, to find an orderly and rational procedure for adjusting all of these inter-related salaries, including those at the top causing the compression. The quadrennial review initiated last year by the Kappel Commission is such a procedure.

COMPETITION WITH STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Surely there is no reason why salaries paid at the Federal level should be less than those paid for essentially the same jobs at the state and local level. In making its studies the Kappel Commission looked at the salaries now in effect throughout the country. Some examples were these:

Governor of New York.....	\$85,000
Manager, Los Angeles Airport.....	44,000
Inheritance tax attorney for Orleans Parish, La.....	80,000
General manager, Public Service Board, San Antonio, Tex.....	40,000
Administrator, University of Alabama School of Medicine.....	50,000
President, University of Washington.....	50,000
Chief engineer, New York Port Authority.....	45,000
Executive director, New York Port Authority.....	70,000

It should be obvious there was something wrong with a system that paid \$70,000 to the head of the New York Port Authority but only \$35,000 to the Secretary of Defense, whose duties involved administering a budget of \$80 billion. There was obviously a need to correct a situation in which a lawyer assisting in the collection of inheritance taxes in Louisiana was paid \$80,000 while the head of the Central Intelligence Agency received only \$30,000.

COMPARABILITY WITH PRIVATE INDUSTRY

Similarly, the Kappel Commission made a study of salaries paid executives in private industry. Following are a few examples:

President, Doyle, Dane Bernbach, Inc., Advertising Agency.....	\$117,211
Executive vice president, the Boeing Aircraft Co.....	109,620
President, Seagram Distillers.....	331,475
Executive vice president, Safeway Stores.....	115,769
President, Phillip Morris, Inc.....	112,500

In case these salaries might be thought unusually high I might point out that studies were made of the average salaries paid the chief executive officers in private industry. It was found, for example, that the

average compensation of the chief executive officers in companies manufacturing durable goods with sales over \$1 billion was \$269,500. That's not the top salary in such a job; it's the average.

To put this in perspective, I might add that in the entire Federal government there are only two or three departments with budgets under \$1 billion, and there are a number of agencies, without department status, having budgets far exceeding that amount. It seems obvious to me that the kind of managerial talent required to administer such budgets cannot differ greatly between private industry and government. Only in the matter of compensation has there been any essential difference.

No one is suggesting, and least of all the Kappel Commission, that Federal executives be paid anything like \$270,000. But this comparison by the Commission should make clear the need for the kind of upward adjustment it has recommended and which has now taken effect.

CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES—SIX INCREASES SINCE 1865

Many people who object to the Kappel Commission report have the opinion that congressional salaries are increased frequently. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, there have been only six congressional salary increases since 1865.

In its report the Kappel Commission recommended that the salary of senators and congressmen should be raised to \$50,000. Members of the Commission made this recommendation, not because they considered 42 per cent as the proper cost-of-living adjustment, or whatever, but because they were attempting, for the first time, to arrive at a rational pay structure for these positions of high responsibility in our government.

In spite of the Kappel Commission's recommendation President Johnson did not assign a \$50,000 salary figure to the Congress. He reduced the amount at the request of many of us in the House and Senate who felt that this was excessive and, furthermore, that Members of Congress might find it necessary to reject the entire package if such an increase were designated for their own salaries. The \$42,500 figure was the result of these pressures for a cutback.

Fortunately, Members of Congress need never again have the sole responsibility for fixing their own salaries, and in all probability no increase of such proportions as this will ever again be necessary. Released from a system which allowed only six pay increases in 104 years, congressional pay can be adjusted in small amounts as changes in our economy warrant. And the remainder of the Federal establishment can be assigned rational compensation, free from this arbitrary and unfair barrier.

In view of the great good that will come from this important step toward responsible personnel management throughout the Federal government it is my judgment that rejection of the Kappel Commission recommendations would clearly not have been in the public interest. Allowing the recommendations, as amended by the President, to become law will have far-reaching effects, in my judgment, in attracting ever more qualified men into government service. If that occurs, the slight additional cost of establishing a rational pay system will be more than compensated by the long-term savings made possible through increased efficiency and economy in our many governmental operations.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 26, 1968]

PRICE TAG ON TALENT

"The ability of our nation to meet the challenges of these troubled times depends on the leadership of those who place their talents and energies at the service of their

country," says the Commission on Executive, Legislative and Judicial Salaries in its report to President Johnson.

The report, now circulating among key officials although not formally released, recommends large salary increases for Senators, Congressmen, Cabinet members, judges and others. Salaries of the President, the Vice President and the Speaker were technically outside the commission's purview, but it suggests boosts for them, too.

These increases for Federal officials are long overdue. The present, grossly inadequate pay scales penalize public-spirited citizens seeking to serve their nation. They cause some to decline to serve. They drive others out of Government employment.

The commission was headed by Frederick R. Kappel, retired head of the giant American Telephone and Telegraph system. The President is expected to use the recommendations in framing Federal salary scales in his budget message; unless Congress specifically acts to overturn these scales, they will become law.

"We should expect the compensation of those to whom we entrust high responsibilities and authority in government to bear some reasonable relationship to that received by their peers in private life," says the commission. It recommends that the salaries of Senators and Congressmen be increased from \$30,000 to \$50,000, Cabinet officers from \$35,000 to \$60,000. Noting that it would be utterly impossible to fix a value on the President's "unique" services, it nonetheless suggests that equity in pay structures demands a doubling of the present \$100,000 salary.

The top salaries paid executives in private industry in 1967 were listed last June in Business Week magazine and they are pertinent: Neil H. McElroy—once a Secretary of Defense—and Howard J. Morgens of Procter & Gamble each made \$325,000; Samuel Bronfman of Distillers Corp.—Seagrams, Ltd., made \$331,475; Harold Geneen of International Telephone and Telegraph received \$250,000 in salary and \$235,000 in other compensation; P. B. Hofmann of Johnson & Johnson made \$277,000 in salary and \$209,142 in additional compensation.

Government need not match these stratospheric rewards. There are compensations in public service that private employment cannot duplicate, but the financial sacrifice required of men of talent and dedication should be far less than it is.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 6, 1969]
MONEY ISN'T EVERYTHING

The U.S. Senate was wise to allow debate, and to put itself on the record, in approving the proposed salary increases for upper-level Federal employees, including the lawmakers themselves. If they had merely sat on their hands, the pay boosts would have gone into effect automatically on Feb. 14.

Tuesday's Senate debate didn't change anything, and perhaps that was the best result. In inflationary times like these, though, the public deserves at least a little fuller explanation of why Federal lawmakers and officials should get such substantial increases.

The largest boost, a doubling of the President's \$100,000 salary, was approved by Congress before Mr. Nixon's inauguration; under the law no Chief Executive's pay can be raised while he is in office. But that increase—after taxes—did not even come close to equaling the rise in the cost of living in the two decades since the President last got a raise.

There isn't the same justification for the other boosts. Members of Congress and many high-level officials last got increases in 1964. While the cost of living has climbed about 14% since then, most of the raises are a good deal larger than that.

One answer could be that the existing Federal salaries were too low, even in 1964. For-

mer President Johnson presumably thinks so: "The salaries we pay our top officials are clearly inadequate," he told Congress. "The proposals I make today are long overdue."

It's certainly true that it's difficult to induce large numbers of top-notch individuals to serve in Government or to run for Congress; President Nixon's recruiters can provide ample, current testimony to that. Whether the difficulties have increased or diminished in recent years, however, may be to some extent a function of the observer's personal political viewpoint.

It's also true that many Congressmen, either from need or desire, cling to outside sources of income while serving. Rep. Wright Patman of Texas has proposed that, in return for the raise, the lawmakers give up any outside employment or business interests. Whether they go that far or not, the lawmakers' increased affluence should prod them to provide a fuller accounting of their potential conflicts of interest—something they're always worried about when they consider appointees to the executive branch.

In any case, the establishment of suitable salary scales is only part of the task of improving Federal management. That fact was clearly recognized by the Committee for Economic Development several years ago when it began its drive for better Government executive performance.

The business-supported research group, in a 1964 study, listed numerous steps toward upgrading management throughout the Government; next to last among its recommendations was "increased compensation at upper levels in Federal service." Assigned at least equal, if not higher, priority was better personnel administration, including executive development and recognition of ability (and inability).

The Government, after all, is a huge business, and people are people, whether they work for the Defense Department or for General Motors. Slipshod procedures, overlapping responsibilities and meaningless tasks can make any job unrewarding for a conscientious individual, no matter how high the salary may be.

Unfortunately the Federal establishment has more than its share of just such jobs. In one area, Congress for once could show the way for the rest of the Government if it would overhaul its seniority system in which the quality that counts is the ability to keep getting elected.

A thorough job of revitalizing Federal management, in other words, must involve a revitalization of the Government itself. If the Government were a better place to work, Federal recruiters would find it easier to attract the caliber of executives who would help make the establishment more efficient and effective.

In an organization of such size, change won't come quickly or easily. And we trust that the legislators, as they await their fatter paychecks, will remember that money is by no means everything.

FLORIDA JOINS THE UNION: 1819-1969

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the permanent settlement of what now is the United States began in 1564 when Rene Laudonniere founded Fort Caroline, near present-day Jacksonville, Fla., for the

French. A year and a half later, Pedro Menendez attacked Fort Caroline and defeated the French, leading to the establishment of St. Augustine, in 1565, by the Spanish. So we are just past the 400th anniversary of our beginnings in the United States of America.

And, Mr. Speaker, the 150th anniversary of Florida joining the United States occurs in the present year.

On February 22, 1819, Spain ceded Florida to the United States for \$5 million. Two years later, on February 22, 1821, the treaty was proclaimed and ratified by President James Monroe.

Florida at that time was divided into two separate provinces, West Florida and East Florida, controlled by Spain.

Secretary of State John Quincy Adams negotiated the treaty, which stated:

His Catholic Majesty cedes to the United States, in full property and sovereignty, all the territories which belong to him, situated to the eastward of the Mississippi, known by the name of East and West Florida.

This transaction underlined the decline of the great European powers at that time and the expansion of the United States of America.

After the signing of the treaty by President Monroe, he named Gen. Andrew Jackson as the "Commissioner of the United States with full power and authority to him to take possession of and to occupy the territories ceded by Spain to the United States." This was on March 10, 1821. While Jackson was the first military governor of Florida, William P. Duval, of Kentucky, was the first civilian governor, taking over his duties on June 20, 1822, from Andrew Jackson.

It is significant that my hometown, Jacksonville, Fla., is named after Jackson, and my home county, Duval, is named after Governor Duval, who is buried here in the District of Columbia. It was in 1845 that Florida became a State.

Mr. Speaker, today Florida is one of our Union's biggest and most productive States. We are ninth in size. We have a rich historical tradition like no other State, and we are in the forefront of man's greatest exploration—sending a man to the moon. We have maturity and we have youthfulness. Our sesquicentennial as part of America is a proud moment.

GORDON W. BLACKWELL AND BENJAMIN E. MAYS: MEN OF THE YEAR

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, two of our Nation's most distinguished educators, Dr. Gordon W. Blackwell, president of Furman University, and Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, president emeritus of Morehouse College, were honored recently by the Greenville, S.C., Chapter of the Society for Advancement of Management. In presenting the society's coveted Man

of the Year Award to Dr. Blackwell, Mr. Arthur Magill, internationally known businessman and philanthropist, read the following citation:

TO GORDON WILLIAMS BLACKWELL

For Distinguished Leadership in the fields of sociology and higher education, as a social scientist, teacher, and college administrator. For working steadily to build with intelligence and thoughtful long-range purpose, the potential of the South.

For Serving, while still a young college professor, as Director of the Institute for Research in Social Science at the University of North Carolina, vastly extending its program in the areas of social psychology, urban studies, and political behavior, and bringing to it also the vital funds in grants and contracts which made its success more sure.

For Establishing, while Chancellor of the Woman's College of The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, a nursing program, and a four-year program in medical technology, for initiating a doctoral program there, and for helping materially to solve critical racial problems in the community.

For Moving Florida State University forward as its president, increasing its enrollment from 9,000 to 12,000 doubling its annual budget, increasing its average faculty salaries by 50 percent, and responsibly handling \$32 million invested or committed in building and improving the physical plant.

For Contributing to the knowledge of our world by scholarly research and published writing in the field of sociology.

For Serving our country during World War Two as a community organization specialist in the Office of Civilian Defense.

But Chiefly Because, as president of your alma mater, Furman University, you have brought this illustrious college rapidly forward, both as an administrator and as a leader in higher education in this state. You have set high goals of good intent for Furman. You have in less than four years raised average faculty salaries by over 40 percent, added men and women of stature to a faculty already recognized as among the finest in the Southeast, and raised the intellectual quality of the student body. You have embarked upon a long-range campaign for capital improvement which is realistic, bold, imaginative, and emblazoned with success. But above all, you have held steadfastly to your goal of bringing Furman University into—and not short of—a posture of excellence by national standards in a manner to bring credit upon yourself and upon your institution.

ARTHUR MAGILL,
Awards Chairman.

In presenting the society's Man of the Year Award to Dr. Mays, Mr. Magill read the following citation:

TO BENJAMIN ELIJAH MAYS

In 1940, on assuming the presidency of Morehouse College, some of the trustees of that institution, because of the difficulty of operating a college with an enrollment of just over 300 in a war-time economy, were in favor of closing Morehouse for the duration, and you decided that to close "The candle in the dark" would be a catastrophic blow to the progress of your race, so instead, against all odds, you decided to keep it open.

During the 1940-1967 period, enrollment increased from 300 to its present level of just under 1,000 students. In 1940 Morehouse had 23 full-time faculty members, two of whom had earned PhD degrees. Morehouse presently has 65 full-time professors, more than half of whom hold doctorates.

You are the author of the following statement, "I am not naive enough to believe that a teacher is a better teacher because he holds an MA, BD, or PhD degree. I am not arguing

that a teacher is more honest, or loves his students more dearly because he has an advanced degree. I am arguing, however, that less training does not make him a better teacher or a more honest man. There is no virtue in an academically weak faculty." During the 1940-1967 period the floor space of Morehouse increased three-fold, land area doubled, and the market value of its endowment rose six-fold. Morehouse's 1940 budget was \$130,000, and the money spent from all sources in the 1967 period was just under \$2,000,000.

Twenty colleges now have, or have had, Morehouse graduates as their presidents. One alumnus was a Nobel Prize winner, another was a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, and countless alumni have distinguished themselves throughout the world.

You have served your country and your church in posts too numerous to be mentioned. Twenty-three honorary degrees are but a slight indication of the high regard in which the educational institutions of this country hold you.

But without a question the sign post of your success cannot be measured in dollars, or square feet, or honorary degrees received, or posts held with distinction, but rather the quality, and character, and integrity, and high-mindedness of the graduates of Morehouse College. Just as we judge parents by their children, so are you judged by the quality of the alumni of the great institution which you so ably guided for twenty-seven years.

Never has so much been achieved with so little and against such great odds. In all humbleness this organization salutes and commends you with the wish that the greatest tribute which could be paid you would be for young men and young women of both races to emulate the example which you in your life have set.

ARTHUR MAGILL,
Awards Chairman.

In accepting their awards, Dr. Blackwell and Dr. Mays spoke of our country's needs for quality education and racial harmony. Believing that their addresses will enlighten and inspire Members of Congress and citizens generally, I include them here as extensions of my remarks:

OUR MOST PRECIOUS RESOURCE (By Gordon W. Blackwell)

Certainly I am honored by this award. Being cognizant of the caliber of those who have been so recognized in the past, I am deeply appreciative. I hope too that I am sufficiently humble because in your selections this year—more than honoring two particular men—I believe you have chosen to give recognition to the crucial importance of colleges and universities. For, after all, it is to these institutions that Dr. Mays and I have devoted the most of our energies.

Along the pipelines that come from Texas and Oklahoma, it is necessary to have pumping stations every few miles. Even when the oil goes downhill it will not go by itself; it's too sluggish. A civilization is like that. Without conscious propulsion, it becomes stagnant. Without thoughtful and sometimes sacrificial effort by the people, a civilization can lose its standards of beauty, right, and truth; art and music become mere decoration; philosophy and religion become sophistry and speculation; and science becomes only technology. Then man is the prisoner of his appetites and his ignorance. We need colleges and universities to encourage the development of new ideas and standards, as well as to communicate the truths of the ages. As Elton Trueblood has put it, "The college is an alternative to triviality."

Here in the Piedmont, with a fine assortment of colleges and universities, we are located in what I believe to be the heart of

the new, the ever new, the forever new South—a term that has become a cliché in technicolor. Old paths from everywhere now run into the freeways as the region moves at a dizzying pace. The modernity of our urban architecture soars high above the old white columns of the land. As Jonathan Daniels has pointed out, we have suffered long enough from the caricature and the calumny about us, and from the romanticism and nostalgia of our own making. Our bootstraps are torn from our tugging on them. Nevertheless, the South appears to be rapidly entering the mainstream of American life.

Education is undoubtedly the most crucial of man's institutions in this movement into the mainstream. For education can raise the quality of human resources through the developed capacities, motivations, and aspirations of the people. It can be a direct influence in determining the kinds of industries which develop in a region. Furthermore, research in university laboratories provides much of the basic knowledge out of which come technological developments. Indeed, through service to people and communities, higher education can provide the single most vital thrust in regional development.

We must, then, consider quality higher education as an investment in human resources as it upgrades the capabilities of a people. In a maturing economy such as we have in the South, by raising the abilities of the labor force education can hasten the trends which are changing the employment mix. These occupational trends include a decreasing proportion of the labor market employed in goods-producing industries and a higher proportion in professional, technical, and service industries where higher levels of education are required. At the same time automation is reducing the proportion of workers in semi-skilled and unskilled jobs. Fully three-fourths of those in technical and professional occupations have some college work. Particularly are we seeing a rapid increase in scientific and engineering employment.

In other words, with a greater emphasis upon white collar than upon blue collar jobs in the Piedmont area, the role of education in upgrading workers becomes increasingly important and demanding. This effort by education must be viewed as an investment.

Theodore W. Schultz, economist of the University of Chicago, has pointed out that investment is "the formation of capital, whether in the form of material things or in human capabilities." In stimulating the economic growth of a region we must make policy choices among investment opportunities, including education. Not until we come to understand that support of education must be viewed as an investment, not a consumption item, will we utilize education wisely in regional development. Among other perspectives, education must be evaluated as capital formation which contributes to economic growth.

Wherever the levels of both education and income are relatively low, as in the South, the return on investment in education is high. In other words, a million dollars invested in education in the Piedmont area will currently yield greater returns than if the investment were made in New York or California.

You are familiar with the figures for variation in average lifetime income according to level of education. For men aged 25 through 64 with less than eight years of elementary school, the expectation is \$106,449; for those with four years of high school, \$215,487; and for those with four or more years of college, \$366,990. Thus, education more than triples the lifetime earning ability of a college graduate as compared with an elementary school dropout. Quoting Professor Schultz again: "When a person improves his capability, it represents an investment in human capital. Such an investment always entails costs; when it enhances the

future earnings of the person these earnings are the returns to what has been invested." He makes the point that human capital has become increasingly important in our technologically advanced economy and that the rate of return on investment in human beings has been higher than that on investment in non-human capital.

But, you say, higher education is certainly much more than an economic investment in people. What about the values of having educated mothers, educated neighbors, improved race relations, reduction of poverty accompanied by reduction in delinquency and crime? What about the social and cultural values of education? Does not education increase the range of human choice in our dynamic society? And, of course, the answer to all these questions is definitely "Yes."

In light of this crucial importance of colleges and universities, it is not surprising that American higher education is in the midst of a development which surely would have staggered the imagination of the leaders in the last century. It is true that we have serious problems in our nation, especially with respect to the distribution of opportunity. But it is also true, and we have been prone to forget this in the recent phase of self-flagellation, that we have broadened educational opportunity at an astounding rate in the last twenty years.

This development has come about both because we can afford it and because we need it. We can afford it because of the increases in productivity, which make possible for young men and women a later entry into the labor pool, as well as an earlier retirement for the older people. We need it because, as I have already noted, the requirements for productive, personally satisfying participation in our society are changing; what agricultural skill was to our forefathers and industrial skill to our fathers, intellectual skill is to our children.

Some decades ago, the intellectual leadership of our nation was coming largely from twenty or so universities. Most of them were private institutions. These elite schools produced nearly all of the leaders in the learned professions, the research scholars and scientists, the shapers of thought and policy.

Twenty years from now our country will need several hundred universities and colleges of genuine quality—both public and private—whose primary responsibilities will be threefold: education for leadership, active pursuit of research and creative efforts, and provision of supporting services which will be diffused throughout society. These several hundred institutions of top rank will comprise less than ten percent of all institutions of higher learning, though they will certainly have more than ten percent of the students. The point is that they will constitute a specialized group, performing a crucial part of the higher education effort.

Among these institutions, the colleges will have one big advantage, that of relatively small size so that the human dimensions of education can be preserved. For example, at Furman with 1900 students we have only now reached what we believe to be that imprecise, minimum critical size for a diversified, intellectually stimulating campus with economical operation. On the other hand, there is no reason to believe that we shall allow Furman to approach the also imprecise point at which an institution becomes so monstrous as to lose its cohesion.

The size limitation of the college, however, will accentuate the hard choices which such institutions face. We and other similar colleges will fulfill our proper role only if we realize that no one college can do everything. Each must keep all of its basic programs at least at a respectable level of acceptability and must have some programs which are truly superior. For each individual institution, its own peaks of excellence—high

enough for all the world to see—will depend on its historical development, community and regional needs, and faculty strength and interests.

But academic programs of quality are not sufficient. There is an ever present danger that our colleges and universities will not relate meaningfully to the needs of the region. Many of them are in the words of Jonathan Daniels, just up the hill from our vilest slums or just across the broomsedge from the cabin where the old door hangs on one hinge. We have stood too aloof from these problems, both as institutions and as individuals. We have dared to be irrelevant! But all this must change. We must take an active part in helping the region develop sound policy so that rapid urbanization will result not in blight and despair but in hope and opportunities for humane living.

Finally, we can no longer neglect statewide planning and coordination in higher education. There needs to be increased voluntary cooperation between institutions of similar type, resulting in strengthened programs and more economical operation. Furthermore, each state—South Carolina, for example—should determine the most desirable institutional mix to maximize its contributions through higher education. At each institution, public and private, the proper student mix by level—lower division, upper division, graduate—must be determined as part of the statewide plan. The State, in its planning, should give careful nurture to private institutions because of their current and potential contributions. As part of this coordination, admission and retention standards should be published by all institutions in order to help prospective students distribute themselves appropriately throughout such a diversified system.

In summary, my proposition is simple and direct. Young people constitute our most precious resource. In today's world, higher education is required to enable many of them to make their maximum contribution. There must be a minority of institutions of first rank to educate leaders. Furthermore, support of education must be looked upon as capital formation which contributes to regional growth. In this great undertaking there is no place for unnecessary duplication and wasteful competition between institutions. Statewide planning and coordination are required to assure the optimum functioning of all institutions.

It is for these reasons, then, that I say again it is heart warming that those responsible have seen fit tonight to recognize the importance to our society of the higher learning.

THE PEOPLE HAVE DRIVEN ME ON (By Benjamin E. Mays)

I may not have done much in these three score years and ten. I may not have contributed much to the uplift of mankind. But if I have contributed anything at all, I am in debt to the people. The people have driven me on. Without them, I would be nothing. My mother could neither read nor write. She was born during the Civil War. My father could read printing fairly well, but he couldn't read handwriting. He was born in 1856, nine years before the close of the Civil War.

When I was born, there wasn't much going for me nor for the Negro in the United States. Under the tutelage of my oldest sister, I had learned my alphabet, could read a bit and could count to a hundred when I entered the one-room, four-months school at the age of six. Some of the people who drove me on even at six years old were those who entered with me, many older than I, who did not know their alphabets, and could not read or count. They and the teacher thought I was exceptional. The teacher spread the news at church on the second Sunday that I was

gifted. The church people thought I was smart. These people in their comments about me helped to drive me on at the tender age of six.

When I was eight or nine, I "spoke my piece" on Children's Day at the church, reciting the fifth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew. After all these years, I can still see and hear the reaction of the crowd. Men stamped their feet, women waved their handkerchiefs, and the whole audience clapped their hands loudly. Despite the fact that we were poor, and no one in my family had anything, and that Negroes were generally badly treated in my early years, it was predicted by the people in the church and in the community that "Bennie" would go far in the world. Although too young to reason it out well, I felt that I was obligated to make their predictions come true. How, I did not know. The confidence the rather unschooled people in my church had in me, and the faith the fifth grade pastor had in me, motivated me beyond measure. I felt I could not let the people down. As I moved away from them, I felt their eyes were upon me.

The years passed; and I was nineteen years old before I could stay in school more than four months out of the year. When finally I could remain in school for the whole nine-month term, and eventually graduated as valedictorian of my class from the high school department of South Carolina State College in Orangeburg, my host of witnesses had greatly increased. By then there were not only the people in the county church in Greenwood County and my parents who expected me to do well, but the faculty and friends at State College also seemed to expect much of me. I had no money. My father was a renter and never owned any land. I had nothing but a determined will, a strong body, and an insatiable desire to get an education and to be somebody worthwhile. I could see no way to accomplish these things; but the eyes of the people at Zion Church, and now my friends in Orangeburg, drove me on.

The people continued to drive me on. Being desirous of competing with men of other ethnic and racial groups in order that I might test my mental ability, despite untold handicaps and many crippling circumstances I found my way to Bates College in Lewiston, Maine. The competition was keen and the weather was cold. My first winter out of South Carolina, the first year I was in Maine, the temperature dropped to 44 below zero. I say jokingly now, but with an element of truth in it, that my feet got cold in Maine in 1917 and they haven't been warm since! As proof of this, I have on two pairs of socks now!

Believing that God was no respecter of person, and that all groups are potentially equal, I wanted to compete with men other than Negroes. At Bates College I received the reassurance that I needed. I knew that my parents, the people in my county church and the people in Orangeburg were expecting me to do well. Many eyes were upon me, for so few Negroes in Greenwood County had the opportunity to further their educations. The people were still driving me on.

I did well at Bates. I won a prize in public speaking, served as president of three college organizations, took part in dramatics, was elected Class Day Orator by my class, graduated with honors and was finally elected to membership in Phi Beta Kappa. To me, these successes were not mine alone but belonged to the people who had driven me on. All down the line, they had encouraged me, not with money but with words of cheer and goodwill. I am sure I might have yielded to many temptations were it not for the fact that I knew I could not afford to let the people down. All through my life, the people have driven me on. I have wanted to live up to their expectations of me.

As I moved on to do graduate work at the University of Chicago, my host of witnesses had increased even more. The Bates College professors, my friends and classmates at the College, all had expressed the belief that I would make it in life. I had a larger audience now. But above all, the prayers of my untutored mother were constant and continuing. She believed God would answer her prayers in my behalf.

So, the years rolled on; and I earned both the A.M. and the Ph.D. degrees from the University of Chicago. These successes meant to me a mandate from the people all the way from South Carolina to Maine and from Maine to the University of Chicago which said "do not let us down."

Many honors have come my way. Many honorary degrees have been conferred upon me. I have been fortunate enough to have the opportunity to travel in North America, Europe, Asia, and Africa. I have represented my government and religious organizations both at home and abroad. All of these things have placed me in the debt of the people. I have no right to be unduly proud, because I am what the people have made me. I can never repay the people for what they have done for me and for what they have meant to me.

In fact, every man who does anything worthwhile and who achieves any success in life owes a debt to the people. No man is an island unto himself. The politician who wins an election owes his victory to the people who believed in him. The business man who makes a profit owes it to the people who buy his product. The painter can be called great only by the people. The greatest singer isn't great without the acclaim of the people. The people make us what we are.

I thought now that I have reached three score and ten I would be through with being obligated to the people for what they have done for me. But tonight, here you come, the Society for the Advancement of Management, with your fine honor, thus placing me deeper in the people's debt. I am deeply grateful for this Award here in my home state, not far from Epworth Post Office where I was born. Whether I deserve the honor of being considered one of South Carolina's distinguished sons, I cannot say. I accept your judgment. I have tried to give a good account of the State in every part of this nation and in the world at large. Your honoring me here tonight is a gratifying and a humbling experience. I am reminded of the words of Paul Laurence Dunbar, the great Negro poet, when he said:

"Mere human strength may stand ill fortune's frown;
So I prevailed, for human strength is mine;
But from the awful throes of great renown,
Naught can protect me save a strength divine.
Help me, O Lord, in this my trembling cause;
I scorn men's curses, but I dread applause!"

I assure you, I shall not relax in my advancing years, but will still let the people drive me on. How can I relax? As long as our soldiers are dying in Vietnam for a cause still unclear, I cannot relax. As long as half of the people of the earth are starving, are illiterate, and have diseased bodies, I cannot have peace of mind. I am no better than they. As long as there are millions in this great country of ours living below the poverty line, I cannot be satisfied with my comfort. As long as the gap between black and white seems to be widening, I can have no peace of mind. All of us are under orders from God to do our bit to make our community, our state, our nation, and the world a better place for all of us to live. Whatever our station in life may be, we are no better than our fellows. Eugene Debs was not wholly in error when he

said, in essence: "As long as there is a lower class, I am in it. As long as there is a criminal element, I am of it. As long as there is a man in jail, I am not free."

TEXTILE QUOTAS COULD HURT SOYBEAN MARKETS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the world's leading trading nation, what we do during this session of Congress may well establish the pattern of trade for the decade to come. We have the opportunity to exercise leadership and diplomacy to overcome the obstacles to trade expansion and lead the world to a greater exchange of goods and services on a worldwide basis. Or we can succumb to the age-old remedy of building a tariff wall and retreating behind it.

Now that the obstacles are formidable—the bugle of retreat has been sounded.

Our patience is being tried. Soybean producers in my district and in those of the districts of other Congressmen in more than 20 other leading soybean-producing States are deeply disappointed in the European Common Market tax proposal. It calls for a tax of \$60 per ton on most vegetable oils and \$30 per ton for oilseed, cake, and meal. These taxes would add the equivalent of 35 to 40 percent ad valorem import duty on our principal trade item, soybean meal. Its impact would affect about 450 to 500 million dollars in U.S. exports. This tax is being proposed by the community to solve its unfortunate dairy surplus.

The U.S. Government has protested this proposal in the strongest possible terms and has reiterated on a number of occasions that action of this kind would substantially damage U.S. trade and would bring swift counteraction, including retaliation, to restore the balance of trade.

This action I subscribe to for I feel it is decidedly in the national interest. We cannot afford to lose a substantial part of a half-billion-dollar annual market which shows promise of further growth without taking suitable retaliatory action.

We must be certain to make the community realize that creating a new problem to solve an existing one is not a constructive way out of the dairy surplus impasse. Their idea is to raise the price of vegetable oils which compete with animal fats such as butter, at the same time introducing some form of consumer subsidy in an effort to encourage increased butter consumption.

Furthermore, the EEC proposal would increase the cost of protein feeds, mainly soybeans, thus shifting a major part of the cost of the solution of the dairy surplus problem from the Common Market finance ministries to the American

farmer. This we cannot and will not accept.

When I was in Bonn, Germany, recently, I warned Finance Minister Franz Josef Strauss that the proposed tax might trigger retaliation in unfortunate forms. He promised me his opposition, but new factors—like the textile quotas—could cause reevaluation.

It is too early to tell the success of our diplomatic offensive on this front, but while the battle is being waged, we should be certain to take no action which would impair chances for success.

Yes, I am afraid that we are about to embark on an action which will turn possible success into almost certain failure. That action is a possible approach on textiles now contemplated at the White House level. In his February 6 press conference, President Nixon said:

Exploratory discussions have taken place and will be taking place with major countries involved to see if we can handle this on a volunteer basis rather than having to go to a legislation which would impose quotas, and I think would turn back the clock in our objective to achieve freer trade.

The President was referring to the textile situation which he characterized as "a special problem which has caused very great distress in certain parts of this country, and to a great number of wage earners, as well as to those who operate our textile facilities."

Undoubtedly, it is true there have been serious dislocations within the textile industry and that there have been American workers thrown out of jobs and textile facilities that have been forced to close. However, the overall condition of the U.S. textile industry appears to be healthy. In fact, the other side of the textile story as reported by the American Importers Association is that profits in the textile industry more than doubled from 1961 to 1968 with an increase in profits of 35.2 percent for the first three quarters of 1968 compared to the first three quarters of 1967.

The same association reports that for the apparel industry, sales grew from 12.4 billion in 1961 to almost 20 billion in 1968, an increase of about 60 percent. Profits from the apparel industry grew from \$331 million in 1961 with an estimated \$856 million in 1968, an increase of about 160 percent. In the first three quarters of 1968, profits were up 27.6 percent over the same period in 1967.

Granted that the imports of some categories of textiles are at record levels—nonetheless, it appears that at a very minimum, substantial elements of the U.S. textile industry are enjoying a very healthy and profitable condition.

I wish only that U.S. farmers enjoyed a profit position even remotely comparable.

Certainly textile interests have not been neglected by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In 1967 the cost to taxpayers of the cotton program actually exceeded the entire market value of the crop. The program, which is still operating, was sold to Congress as necessary to improve the competitive position of cotton textiles.

However, even accepting the argument that the U.S. textile industry has some special problems, it would seem advisable that they be weighed carefully in the national interest rather than become the subject of an immediate approach to the world for a so-called voluntary agreement restraining exports of textiles to the United States.

At this moment, I am not aware that the President has appointed a special trade representative. Furthermore, plain American horse sense indicates that no foreign country is going to participate in a textile arrangement without exacting stiff concessions.

According to the New York Times editorial on February 7:

The European Economic Community is likely to demand the reciprocal right to impose a special tax on oilseed products, a measure that could jeopardize nearly \$500 million of United States soybean exports. In Japan, which is being asked to lift import quotas and loosen restrictions on investment by American auto companies, protectionist sentiment would be greatly strengthened.

It appears to me that the U.S. farmer is being asked to pay the price for economic adjustment in the textile industry, thereby placing the great rich land areas of the Midwest and Southwest in jeopardy.

I take the position that by vigorous action, the United States can continue to fight the battle for the growth of trade rather than restrict trade and that this is best accomplished by taking positive aggressive action and not seeking agreements.

Everyone knows that when you accept a voluntary agreement—it ceases to be voluntary—it then becomes mandatory.

On February 10 the American Farm Bureau Federation's official newsletter quoted the president, Charles Shuman, as saying:

U.S. agriculture will decline and decay if it is forced to shrink production to the needs of the domestic market. There is no need for farmers to accept this fate. We have the most highly diversified and most efficient agricultural production in the world. Farmers and ranchers can compete in world markets.

Mr. Shuman went on to say that in order to give farmers an opportunity to compete for world markets, Congress should adopt a trade expansion act which would authorize the President to pursue trade negotiations designed to reduce restrictions on world trade with nations which are prepared to offer reciprocal benefits to U.S. exports.

Future negotiations must not only include—they must emphasize—trade and agricultural progress.

Mr. Shuman also pointed out that the Farm Bureau opposes any attempt to set agricultural trade apart from industrial trade and to allocate international agricultural markets through the use of international commodity agreements.

On the same basis I think we should oppose international agreements whether labeled as voluntary or not, which tend to allocate industrial markets.

At this moment, the new administration is contemplating the possible reduc-

tion in the price-support level for soybeans. Reasons for the likely reductions are to discourage overproduction, but also to make soybeans more competitive in overseas markets where soybean oil must compete with other sources of vegetable oils.

So at a time when soybean farmers—most of them in agreement are about to make a painful adjustment—why should the U.S. textile industry be protected against adjustments which will improve its competitive position?

In the long run, I feel the U.S. textile industry will be more prosperous and will provide more jobs for American wage earners if it is not encumbered by so-called voluntary international agreement than if it now succumbs to the easy temptation of gaining momentary advantage through such course of action.

I now call to your attention a publication issued by the University of Minnesota Agricultural Extension Service called the Protectionist Mood in Midwest Agricultural Trade. This publication was developed by the North Central Public Affairs Subcommittee on Agricultural Trade.

In its analysis of "the consequences of protection," this publication concludes that:

Perhaps the most dramatic consequence of increasing protection is that foreign nations usually retaliate by increasing their tariffs and other trade barriers against the products of the protecting nation. One reason that world trade volume declined almost 50 per cent in the thirties was that the depression-induced tariff increases of the United States were met by retaliatory tariff hikes in other nations. Their hikes led to another round of tariff increases and more retaliation. This action and reaction intensified and prolonged the worldwide slump in economic activity.

Today many of our foreign customers, especially those in Western Europe already operating complex, non-tariff trade restrictions that limit our potential export volume. They do it mainly to protect their own farmers from internal competition. It would take only a modest tightening of these restrictions to deeply cut into U.S. farm exports.

When one nation retaliates against another, the burden of reprisal falls on industries and sectors other than the one that gains the initial protection. Unfortunately, the protecting nation cannot select the sectors that will take the counter blow. This is left to the discretion of the retaliatory. But usually the revenge will fall on export industries that generally are among the most efficient in the country. So more jobs may be lost and more resources idle from the retaliatory effect that have been sustained by the protection.

So, I again call your attention to the fact that we are now engaged in a battle to offset the attempt by the EEC to strike a severe blow at one of our greatest sources of renewable wealth—agriculture. While we are in the midst of this battle, we should not compromise our capability to win by asking for a concession in the form of a voluntary textile agreement.

By asking for this concession, we limit our offensive action and invite the world to name its price—and from experience you and I know that when the United

States is asked by the world to pay a price—that price is frightfully high.

So I call upon the President when he journeys to Europe on his important mission not to make commitments on a voluntary textile agreement—in order not to compromise the action of those who fight against soybean taxes in the Common Market and certainly not to jeopardize negotiations in Japan aimed at market liberalization in that country.

Japan, incidentally, is this Nation's leading importer of U.S. agricultural production. While the past administration was unsuccessful in its year-end attempt to gain liberalization for U.S. farmers in that market—there are reasons to believe that the new administration will be more successful. But why should this possibility be jeopardized by first asking for restrictions which might well trigger retaliation.

Consequently, it appears to me there is nothing to gain and everything to lose by rushing into a textile agreement. I call upon the administration to carefully weigh the matter—to take the time for it to be thoroughly studied and analyzed and reviewed by those skilled and experienced in international trade and familiar with the financial crisis and balance-of-payments problem facing this Nation.

Certainly in the meantime the interests of farmers in Illinois and throughout the Midwest should not be scuttled—perhaps never to be retrieved.

FOUNDATIONS: TAX-FREE POLITICS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while our sons are used as sacrificial lambs for \$185 per month in a no-win war against Communist aggression—and their parents labor under the highest taxes ever saddled on the American people—the tax-exempt Ford Foundation has felt impelled to find "a suitable expression of sympathy" over the death of a politician, and has awarded eight of his former political staff members grants totaling over \$131,000.

President Bundy would justify this featherbedding maneuver with an alibi that the grants are merely to help "ease the transition between public and private life."

Just think what \$131,000, or even a part of it, would mean to any of our districts back home.

This discrimination in favor of special-interest groups and against the tax-paying citizen is the reason I introduced in the 90th Congress and have reintroduced House Resolution 39 to establish a Select Committee To Investigate Tax-Free Foundations.

I include several news reports and the text of House Resolution 39, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 12, 1969]

EIGHT R. F. K. STAFFERS GOT FORD FOUNDATION GRANTS TOTALING \$131,069 FOR TRAVEL AND STUDY

Eight former aides of the late Sen. Robert F. Kennedy have been awarded Ford Foundation travel and study grants totaling \$131,069, records of a House Small Business subcommittee showed today.

The subcommittee, headed by Rep. Wright Patman, D-Tex., has been investigating tax-exempt foundations for more than eight years. Patman, who has been at odds with Ford Foundation President McGeorge Bundy, is to be the opening witness at tax reform hearings beginning Tuesday before the Ways and Means Committee.

In reply to questions by Patman, David E. Bell, acting chief executive officer of the Ford Foundation, said the awards to the former Kennedy staffers were in line with its practices and purposes.

(United Press International said the grants were offered as part of a program to ease the transition between public and private life for the former staffers.)

The recipients and the purposes for which the grants were made were listed as:

Jerry Bruno, Kennedy's chief advance man, \$19,450 for a seven-month study of methods and styles of national political campaigning in the United States.

Joseph Dolan, former administrative assistant, \$18,556 for a six-month study of teaching methods, text materials and other writings used in law school and university courses dealing with the lawyer's role in the legislative processes.

Peter Edelman, legislative assistant, \$19,901 for a five-month study of community development and social programs in various countries of Europe, the Far and Middle East and Africa, with special emphasis on the degree to which participation of individual citizens is encouraged in planning and policy making.

Dall Forsythe, staff assistant, \$6,390 for a four-month study of the changes that have occurred in participation by citizens in political processes, especially in the nominating processes of the Democratic party.

Earl Graves, staff assistant, \$19,500 for a six-month study of opportunities for black citizens to engage in small business in the United States.

Thomas Johnston, assistant, \$10,190 for a study of the feasibility of a national or international newspaper transmitted by television.

Adam Walinsky, legislative assistant, \$22,200 for a six-month study of community self-determination, self-control and self-improvement, with special attention to particular urban areas and experiments in Eastern European countries.

Frank Mankiewicz, press secretary, \$15,692 for studies of the effects of Peace Corps community development projects in Latin American and Caribbean countries.

Bell wrote in reply to questions by Patman that the qualifications of recipients had been reviewed under the foundation's normal procedures and the costs of their programs calculated in the usual way.

"The only unusual feature of these cases is that all of the individuals were associated with one man," he said.

"It seems generally recognized that Sen. Kennedy had gathered around him a staff of great ability and energy, a staff which was cast adrift through Sen. Kennedy's sudden and terrible death.

"We believed that certain of these men qualified for the foundation's travel and study awards, that their talents, through service to an important public figure, had

made a significant contribution to the life of the country, and might continue to be applied to the public well-being . . . and that their collective association with Sen. Kennedy ought not to prevent recognition of their individual promise."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 20, 1969]

BUNDY DEFENDS FORD GRANTS AS SHOW OF R. F. K. SYMPATHY
(By Shirley Elder)

McGeorge Bundy said today that the Ford Foundation, which he heads, was searching for a suitable expression of sympathy over the death of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy last year when it decided to award \$131,000 in travel grants to eight of the senator's former aides.

These were men of special promise who had suffered a special blow, Bundy told the House Ways and Means Committee, which is probing tax-free foundations. And he said he felt the awards fit Ford's basic charter role.

"The number (of grants) was unusual," Bundy said. "The case was unusual. The quality of the (Kennedy) staff was unusual. And I expect the results to be good."

Rep. John Byrnes of Wisconsin, the committee's top Republican, asked "whether we haven't gone a little too far in this area."

Bundy defined the action as fully justified. He said the "fundamental protection" against abuses is the public accountability of foundation expenditures.

Explaining the Kennedy staff grants, Bundy started with the first of last spring's two tragic deaths, the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in April. Ford Foundation officials discussed what to do and decided to continue a grant to King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference and to give \$8,000 for a compilation of the King papers.

When Kennedy was killed, Bundy said, the same questions were raised. There was nothing to offer the family but sympathy and concern, he said, and, looking to Ford's long tradition of individual grants, decided on the eight awards to the Kennedy staff.

He said the men are unusually talented, dedicated, devoted and concerned citizens—"what were they going to do?"

The foundation action also won support from Rep. Hugh Cary, D-N.Y., who praised the Kennedy staff as "uncommonly intelligent and industrious." All served at salaries lower than they could have gotten elsewhere, he said, and all had received lucrative offers after Kennedy's death.

The grants were not rewards, but rather assistance so they could continue to serve their country, he said.

Bundy, a friend of the Kennedy circle, served as a high-level adviser to both Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.

Bundy also told the committee that a number of congressmen and an aide to former President Lyndon B. Johnson had received four grants at various times. The aide, Joseph Califano, got \$12,000, he said.

Bundy said the congressmen generally received travel grants to attend international meetings or to inspect urban centers.

Rep. James Burke, D-Mass., asked whether such grants might influence votes and demanded the names of all congressmen who have accepted such money.

Bundy said he would supply them later.

Bundy said the grants are not designed to "buy votes." He said the projects are seen as "educational" and in the public interest.

Without waiting for specific questions, Bundy defended contributions to the Congress of Racial Equality and others in Cleveland. Rep. Wright Patman, D-Tex., had suggested a link between the Cleveland grants

and the subsequent election of Carl B. Stokes as mayor.

Of the grants to CORE and others—totaling \$475,000 in two years—Bundy said voter registration was the smallest of the programs aided. Moreover, he said, arrangements were made to have a special consultant to make sure the activities aided did not overlap into any actual political campaign.

"We accepted our responsibility to help patrol that boundary," he said.

In prepared testimony, Bundy said proposals to restrict the stock holdings of foundations might impede several social action programs his institution is considering. He also said the proposal to limit foundation holdings to no more than 20 percent of the stock of any one company would have prevented establishment of the Ford Foundation and several others.

If the limit were imposed now, Bundy said, programs now under consideration by Ford to stimulate business in ghettos, provide jobs in the South and assist construction of integrated housing might be impeded.

However, Bundy told the committee, the Ford Foundation, which is worth \$3.5 billion, hopes as a matter of "prudent investment policy" to reduce its holdings of Ford Motor Co. stock to less than 20 percent of the firm's total stock by 1971.

When the foundation was started, 90 percent of its financing was a gift from the auto company.

"We don't own more than 20 percent," he said, but "this has nothing to do with control" of the firm since it is in nonvoting stock.

A better guarantee against foundations getting too involved in profit-making businesses would be to set up an independent board of trustees, rather than "a prohibition of equity hearings," Bundy testified.

The investigation into tax exemptions for all charitable foundations, is being conducted by the House Ways and Means Committee as part of a comprehensive study of tax reform.

At yesterday's session, Chairman Wilbur Mills of Arkansas said he wants to explore with each foundation the question of whether conditions have changed since the tax breaks first were acquired.

H. RES. 39

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of organizations which have been granted exemptions from Federal income taxes under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, for the purpose of determining whether such organizations comply with the provisions of such section, and whether modification of such provisions would be in the public interest by restoring to taxable revenue the incomes presently declared tax free.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and

documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

ISRAEL TELLS ARABS TO BLOCK GUERRILLAS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington, D.C., Evening Star of February 19, 1969:

The United States moved quickly on several fronts today to head off Israeli retaliation for the Arab attack on an El Al airliner in Zurich yesterday.

In a strong statement, the State Department said that the United States will raise "this general matter" at the council meeting Monday in Montreal of the International Civil Aviation Organization, the special United Nations agency dealing with air traffic.

Department spokesman Robert J. McCloskey said the United States hopes to have a "specific proposal" ready for action. He also tied this latest shooting with another problem closer to home—the hijacking of American commercial airliners to Cuba.

On the Arab-Israeli situation, the State Department also announced that Israeli Minister Shlomo Argov met this morning with Joseph Sisco, assistant secretary of state for middle eastern affairs.

During the meeting at the State Department, Sisco is understood to have explained the American initiative, leaving the "implication" that the United States does not want Israel to blame Lebanon for the Arab attack on an Israeli jet at Athens in December. Israeli commandos subsequently struck Beirut's International Airport and destroyed 13 Lebanese planes.

Carmel said the hijack of an El Al plane to Algeria last July and the attacks in Athens and Zurich all originated, in Israel's view, from Lebanon. He said the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine took full credit for the Swiss incident in a statement published in Beirut yesterday.

"The responsibility for such acts is not only with the perpetrators but with the Arab states in which these acts are being planned and where the terrorists are being equipped," Carmel said.

He warned of "complete chaos among the airways of the Middle East unless" the attacks are halted, and added: "Safeguarding air safety is important not only to Israel but the Arabs and all the Arab airlines who want to keep their routes open. They should take immediate action."

Carmel had hinted earlier that there might be retaliation for the machine gunning of El Al's Boeing 720 at Zurich's airport. Six persons aboard the plane were wounded. Of the four raiders, one was shot dead and the others, including a woman were arrested.

The transport minister told the Tel Aviv newspaper Maariv: "The Arab governments

who are concerned with preserving the international airlinks of their countries would do well to hold back the saboteurs, and thus avoid the deterioration and destruction of the airways of the Middle East."

The U.S. State Department and U.N. Secretary-General U Thant condemned the Arab attack in Zurich, and Thant expressed hope there would be no reprisal. But leading Israeli newspapers promised retaliation.

The semiofficial newspaper Lemerhav declared: "The sabotage of airways cannot be one-sided. The Israeli security authorities must reach the proper conclusions with regard to this extension of Arab terror."

Hayom, published by the rightwing Gahal party, said Israel "must react because her neighbors understand no other language."

The guerrillas opened up on the El Al Boeing 720 from behind a snowbank yesterday as it taxied down a runway at Zurich's Kloten airport to take off for Tel Aviv. Six of the 27 persons aboard, most of them Israelis, were wounded.

The most seriously injured were trainee pilot Yoran Peres, hit in the abdomen by three bullets. He was reported out of danger following an emergency operation at the Zurich Cantonal Hospital.

ISRAELI, THREE ARABS HELD

Zurich police said an Israeli security agent jumped from the plane through an emergency hatch after the first burst of fire and killed one of the attackers with a shot through the head from his automatic pistol.

Swiss firemen raced to the scene and arrested the other three Arabs. They said they had to overpower the Israeli agent "otherwise he would have killed the others as well."

The Israeli and the three Arabs were in custody today and were to appear before an examining magistrate. It was assumed the Israeli agent would plead self-defense.

Sources at Bern, where the Swiss cabinet met to discuss the incident, said Israel was expected to file an early request for the extradition of the three Arabs. But legal experts there said Switzerland is virtually certain to reject this, because the Swiss legal code stipulates jurisdiction over crimes committed in the country.

Police said the attackers also hurled incendiary bombs and hand grenades at the plane, but they failed to explode. Three parcels of plastic explosives were found in the Arabs' rented car.

Soon after the attack on the Amsterdam-Tel Aviv flight, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, a pro-Marxist guerrilla group based in Jordan, issued a communique assuming "full responsibility" for the attack. It said the raid was in reprisal for "brutality and torture" committed on Arab civilians by Israel authorities in occupied territory.

PFLP is the same group that claimed credit for the hijacking of an El Al plane over the Mediterranean last July 23 and the shooting up of an El Al airliner in Athens Dec. 26. The latter, in which one passenger was killed, prompted the Israeli raid on Beirut.

Foreign Minister Abba Eban said the Zurich attack "demonstrated the murderous characteristics" of Arab guerrilla organizations, encouraged by the "atmosphere of compassion demonstrated toward these organizations after the Athens attack." He said that the U.N. Security Council "issued not one word of condemnation of the Athens attack."

Eban pointedly added that "it will be surprising and astonishing if the conscience of the world is not aroused by this attack on the lives of civilians, on freedom of flight and the sovereignty of a neutral and peace-loving country," meaning Switzerland.

Swiss police said the guerrillas used Soviet Kalashnikov submachine guns. About 50 bullets hit the Boeing, mostly in the forward

first-class compartment and cockpit, shattering the instrument panel, navigational and radio equipment.

The Amman communique identified the four guerrillas as Amina Dahbour, a 25-year-old woman schoolteacher from Israeli-occupied Gaza; Ibrahim Tewfik, a laborer from Haifa, Israel's chief port; Abdel Mohsen Hassan, a driver from Lydda, in central Israel, and Mohamed Abu el Haja, a laborer from Nazareth, which also is in Israel.

It was not known here which one was killed.

On the Israeli political front, informed sources said Premier Levi Eshkol had averted a crisis in his Labor party by hinting that he was considering resigning.

It began when Newsweek magazine quoted him as saying Israel does not seek "any part of the settled area of Jordan's west bank," and right-wing parties in the government coalition were angered at this implied hint of territorial concessions to the Arabs and other Labor party leaders were critical of Eshkol's handling of the situation.

But when Eshkol let it be known he was getting "fed up," the dissenters quickly persuaded him to stay on as premier, fearing Defense Minister Moshe Dayan might get a crack at the job. Most Labor party leaders strongly oppose Dayan.

WITHDRAWING APPELLATE JURISDICTION FROM THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 7201, a bill to amend title 18 and title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the trial and review of criminal actions involving obscenity. It will be remembered that last year the subject of Supreme Court decisions in the area of obscenity and pornography had arisen during the Senate hearings on the confirmation of Justice Abe Fortas for the position of Chief Justice. Citizens for Decent Literature, a 10-year-old organization of citizens concerned about the enforcement of obscenity and pornography statutes, had its three lawyers review Supreme Court decisions in this area during 1966 and 1967. The results of the review proved to be a real eye-opener. In 1967, for instance, the highest court of the land reversed 23 of the 26 State and Federal obscenity determinations. The community standards of 13 States were upset. Eight findings of fact by juries were reversed. Thus, while the Court in the Roth decision in 1957 emphasized the criterion of contemporary community standards in obscenity cases, the same Court since that time has struck down decisions of juries and State courts at an alarming rate.

The purpose of H.R. 7201 is to return to the States and localities the right to make a determination of fact as to what is obscene. The appellate jurisdiction of the Federal courts is withdrawn in this area, although it must be remembered that a constitutional issue can still be decided by the Supreme Court.

There is no doubt that the citizens of our land are a prime target for the smut peddlers whether here or abroad. The veteran newsmen of the Chicago Tribune, Willard Edwards, cited the case of a Paris publisher of pornographic books who came to the United States and observed there seems to be an endless demand for the stuff. The question of how best to approach the problem was spelled out by Mr. Edwards in his column of February 18, entitled "Flow of Smut Remains Issue for Congress," which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

FLOW OF SMUT REMAINS ISSUE FOR CONGRESS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, February 17.—A Paris publisher of pornographic books, on a recent visit to the United States, said he expected to clean up 5 million dollars in six months and exulted:

"There seems to be an endless demand for the stuff."

His statement could not be disputed. Pornography is a billion dollar a year business in the United States.

Why doesn't Congress do something about it? There is no issue commanding greater indignation. But, over the years, anti-obscenity laws invariably get caught up in emotional controversy. They create fears of censorship, of infringement of the first amendment's guarantee of freedom of expression.

The temptation, for example, is to predict swift passage at this session of one new measure. It would impose jail sentences on peddlers of obscene materials who knowingly use the mails to poison the minds of children.

President Nixon has strongly endorsed such a bill and promised vigorous enforcement of it. In the few days of the present session, scores of measures with a similar objective have been introduced. Even the Supreme court, often split on definitions of obscenity for adults, has nodded its approval of laws to protect children's minds from pornography.

FILTH MERCHANTS AREN'T TOO WORRIED

And yet, experience dictates caution in forecasting enactment of even this limited legislative proposal. The merchants of filth are not too worried.

Nearly 100 years ago, Congress banned obscenity from the mails. But the definition of obscenity has been enveloped in a maze of legal cobwebs. The Supreme court has seemed unwilling to find any material illicit that is sold to adults although, as noted, it now concedes states the constitutional right to protect juvenile minds.

In recent years, Congress has been able to agree on only two approaches to the problem, both modest and tentative.

The first step was establishment in October, 1967, of a Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, headed by William B. Lockhart, dean, University of Minnesota school of law. Its 18 members were directed to study the traffic in obscenity, its effect on minors, and to recommend legislative or other action to regulate such traffic "without interfering with constitutional rights."

The commission, however, is not required to report its findings until Jan. 31, 1970. Its existence may be used by some legislators to argue for delay on congressional action this year.

LAW TO CONTROL SMUT IN MAILS

The second step was passage last April 15 of a law which permitted householders to protest the flow of obscene mail, mostly advertising, into their homes. They could notify

local postal inspectors to direct mailers to remove their names and addresses from mailing lists. If the mail continued, the attorney general could be requested to seek a court order. Continued violations would subject the mailer to contempt of court citations and penalties.

The response of an outraged citizenry was evidence of nation wide resentment. The post office was flooded with complaints at the rate of 12,500 a month. More than 95,000 prohibitory orders were issued.

Yet this was no more than a tap on the wrist to the big business of pornography which sends 100 million pieces of material thru the United States mails each year.

Two congressional leaders, Sen. Dirksen [R., Ill.] and Sen. Mike Mansfield [D., Mont.] and Rep. John M. Ashbrook [R., O.], believe one solution is to limit the Supreme court's appellate jurisdiction in obscenity cases. The high court then could no longer reverse the factual findings of a jury in obscenity cases.

This proposal has appeal to many in Congress eager to assail the Supreme court on any plane. But waging a legislative war against pornography on this basis will involve a protracted struggle. Less provocative measures like the children's antiobscenity act could get lost in the scuffle.

Mr. Speaker, an indication of the severity of the issue can be gleaned from the fact that both the Democratic and Republican leaders of the Senate, Senators MANSFIELD and DIRKSEN, submitted bills similar to H.R. 7201. Both Senators commented on the merits of this particular approach in their remarks on the Senate floor on September 18, 1968.

Both the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee approved a resolution in January of this year which endorses the withdrawal of appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in the area of obscenity. The text of the resolution is as follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 8

A resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to exercise its power, pursuant to Article III, Section 2 of the United States Constitution, to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court relative to its review of any decisions of the courts of the several states or of any United States Court of Appeals in cases involving the regulation, control, censorship or prohibition of the sale, distribution, display or presentation of any printed matter, photograph, drawing, printing, moving picture film, recording or performance, where such regulation, control, censorship or prohibition is exercised on the ground that the same is pornographic or obscene

Whereas, the people of the State of Tennessee deplore the filth and pornography which now infests many of the theatres and news stands in this State; and

Whereas, The prevalence of prurient films, books, and magazines depicting depravity, pornography, and obscenity panders to the lowest elements in human nature and depraves the character of individuals and of the community; and

Whereas, The establishment and maintenance of minimum standards of decency within a community is, and of right ought to be, the privilege and power of the people of that community, acting within reasonable constitutional limits; and

Whereas, The judicial determination of what constitutes legally defined pornography and obscenity is in each case primarily a question of fact, which ought to be decided by the court or jury which tries the facts, and such trial courts and juries are qualified to distinguish between art and pornography

and to determine whether statutory definitions acceptable bounds of decency within their communities, and are as qualified to do so as are the justices of the United States Supreme Court; and

Whereas, The United States Supreme Court has shown a deplorable lack of judicial restraint in failing to respect the wisdom and judgment of the Courts of the respective states and the United States Courts of Appeals and in undermining the efforts of responsible state and local law-making and law enforcement officials to protect their communities from the inroads of purveyors of pornography and perversion and has substituted the subjective personal views of some of the justices for the conclusions of the state Supreme Court and the United States Courts of Appeals; and

Whereas, The various opinions of the justices of the United States Supreme Court on the subject of the control of pornography have been confusing and conflicting, so that, they have left the law in a state of uncertainty and have furnished no reliable guides to local officials who are responsible for maintaining decency in their communities; and

Whereas, the alarming increase of even bolder and more vicious pornography throughout this state and nation, and the helplessness of responsible local officials effectively to protect their people from it because of the United States Supreme Court opinions, demonstrate conclusively that the United States Supreme Court should not exercise jurisdiction over such matters; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Eighty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, That the General Assembly of the state of Tennessee does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to exercise its power, pursuant to Article III, Section 2 of the United States Constitution, to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court, so that, it shall have no power to review any decision of the courts of the several states or of any United States Court of Appeals in any case involving the regulation, control, censorship or prohibition of the sale, distribution, display or presentation of any printed matter, photograph, drawing, printing, moving picture film, recording or performance, where such regulation, control, censorship or prohibition is exercised on the ground that same is pornographic or obscene.

Be it further resolved, That this resolution be sent to the legislative assembly of every other state in the union, and that they be urged to join the state of Tennessee in petitioning the Congress for the passage of such legislation, to restore to the States and the people thereof the power to protect themselves from the degrading effects of the public display of pornography and obscenity.

Adopted: January 16, 1969.

FRANK L. GANELL,

Speaker of the Senate.

WILLIAM L. JENKINS,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, January 17, 1969.

BUFORD ELLINGTON,

Governor.

Mr. Speaker, it is hoped that the appellate jurisdiction approach will receive consideration in the U.S. House and Senate as it did in the State of Tennessee, and hopefully will receive in other States. It seems almost useless to enact statutes or to make judgments concerning obscenity at local and State levels if the smut peddlers are assured of a reasonable chance of success at the Supreme Court level.

I realize that there will be no lack of opposition to this proposal, but because

of the importance of the issue it should be given consideration and voted up or down.

I include the text of H.R. 7201 in the RECORD at this point:

H.R. 7201

A bill to amend title 18 and title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the trial and review of criminal actions involving obscenity, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 71, title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1466. DETERMINATIONS OF FACT

"In every criminal action arising under this chapter or under any other statute of the United States determination of the question whether any article, matter, thing, device, or substance is in fact obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, vile, or filthy shall be made by the jury, without comment by the court upon the weight of the evidence relevant to that question, unless the defendant has waived trial by jury."

(b) The section analysis of that chapter is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new item:

"1466. Determinations of fact."

SEC. 2. (a) Title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 176—ACTIONS INVOLVING OBSCENITY

"Sec.

"3001. Judicial review.

"§ 3001. JUDICIAL REVIEW

"(a) In any criminal action arising under any statute of the United States for the prosecution of any person for the possession, sale, dissemination, or use of any obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, vile, or filthy article, matter, thing, device, or substance, no court of the United States or of the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to review, reverse, or set aside a determination made by a jury on the question whether such article, matter, thing, device, or substance is in fact obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, vile, or filthy.

"(b) In any criminal action arising under any statute of any State or under any law of any political subdivision of any State for the prosecution of any person for the possession, sale, dissemination, or use of any obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, vile, or filthy article, matter, thing, device, or substance, no court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to review, reverse, or set aside a determination made by a court of such State on the question whether such article, matter, thing, device, or substance is in fact obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, vile, or filthy."

(c) The analysis of title 28, United States Code, preceding part I thereof is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"176. Actions involving obscenity---- 3001".

(c) The chapter analysis of part VI, title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"176. Actions involving obscenity---- 3001".

THE U.S. ECONOMY IN THE 1970'S

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the attention of my col-

leagues a very interesting article on the outlook for our economy in the 1970's. It is written by Laurence J. Ackerman, president of the Norwich Savings Society, Norwich, Conn., in my congressional district.

I have known Mr. Ackerman for many years as a keen observer of economic problems, and taught under him when he was dean of the School of Business Administration at the University of Connecticut. His views on the subject and his look ahead should be of considerable interest not only to the Congress, but also to those in the executive branch of our Government dealing with economic problems, as well as to economists, industrialists, bankers, and business people generally.

The article reads as follows:

NEARING THE 1970'S, ECONOMY SIGNS ARE OUTSTANDING

A tremendous boom in the Seventies is seen by Laurence J. Ackerman, president, Norwich Savings Society in this look at the economy: Titled, *A Glance Backward—A Glance Forward*, he reports:

In November the American electorate decided that 1969 would be the year of political transition. Will 1969 also be a year of economic transition—a movement from an overheated inflationary race to a less exuberant, more sustainable rate of economic expansion.

The years 1960-1968 witnessed the greatest and longest sustained economic boom in American history. Industrial production, Real Gross National Product, corporate profits, interest rates, personal consumption expenditures, all moved forward in an almost uninterrupted fashion.

In 1968 faced with a series of national and international economic crises, two fundamental moves were made by our national administration to create economic normalcy. A temporary tax increase was voted by Congress and governmental spending cuts were ordered. As a result of these steps, economists forecast a cooling-off of the economy by mid-1968. The predictions turned out to be wrong. The economy failed to slow down. Two major reasons were offered for this unexpected result. The proposed government cut proved illusory.

The budget deficit was predicted at 5 billion. It will be closer to 12 billion. But the big kicker was the American consumer. His reaction to higher taxes since July has been to go on a spending spree fueled by a reduction in his savings and an increase in his debts. The business and financial community has, in turn, reacted to this consumer stance by betting on continued inflation and by behaving accordingly.

The failure of a tighter fiscal policy—federal budget cutting and increased taxes—to slow the expansion in the economy has pointed up the division between the two predominant schools of economic theory. The followers of the so-called "new economics" regard fiscal policy as the most direct and potent method to regulate the economy.

In opposition to this group are the monetary theorists who argue that monetary policy especially changes in the supply of money represents the dominant economic influence. This latter group claims that a prime reason for the failure of the fiscal restraints to brake the economy decisively was the comparatively easy monetary policy that the Federal Reserve Board followed during the first half of 1968.

The Board permitted the money supply (currency outside banks plus demand deposits) to expand rapidly in most of 1968.

It was growing up to July at a rate of nearly 7 per cent. In defense of the Board's alleged mistake, it was probably influenced by the need to assist the Treasury to finance the enormous budgetary deficits that were then imminent. In addition there was the potential of an economic overkill from the fiscal moves and the Board feared a recession rather than a mere slowing in the rate of expansion.

The Federal Reserve soon recognized this miscalculation and instituted restrictive monetary policies by raising the discount rate and leaving unchanged the maximum rates payable on certificates of deposit and time deposits.

Since mid-summer there is evidence of this posture—the money supply has been increasing at only a 2 per cent to 3 per cent annual rate.

All of this sets the stage for 1969. The evidence seems to point to a less rapid economic pace. Retail sales while quite high have been edging down since mid-summer. Summer spending should be dampened in the first half of 1969 (a) increased Social Security tax collections begun in January; and (b) increased tax payments—or reduced funds—to make up for the retroactive portion of the surtax yet to be paid.

The prospects for federal government spending are reasonably within the realm of control in 1969.

The expectations are for less upward thrust in federal expenditures in 1969 than in any of the three preceding years. This flows from the legislated hold-down in spending and to the prospects for a significantly smaller rise in defense outlays, even if the Vietnam war continues.

On the State and local government scene, the vistas are gloomy. There seems to be no end in sight for increased spending. In response to the mounting pressure of population growth and demand for more and better public services, outlays will rise at a substantial rate.

In the business sector prospects for plant and equipment expenditures are surprisingly strong. The McGraw Hill survey suggests a rise of 8 per cent for 1969.

Over all the nation's total output of goods and services should rise by some 6 per cent in 1969, a considerably slower rate of growth than the 9 per cent for 1968.

What about interest rates? With the more stringent monetary policy of the Federal Reserve and the demand for funds from the private sector of the economy at a high rate, interest rates will continue to be high.

In fact some are asking: will we have a credit crunch like 1966? The general feeling is that we will not experience such a severe test again. The monetary base has grown substantially as pointed out previously.

The result is that more money and credit are available although admittedly at high rates. Further, financial institutions are more liquid than they were in 1966. To sum up on interest rates, they may recede modestly from their current peaks but it seems unreasonable to expect any major decline.

The mortgage market should benefit from the slight easing of general financial pressure. There should be mortgage money but the interest rates should continue at their present level.

Fueled by the combustible mixture of available funds and a substantial backlog of unsatisfied housing demands, residential building should be on the upbeat. This is so despite high land and construction costs. Most of the action will be in the multi-family sector to satisfy the demands for rental units by our increasing number of younger and older households.

What does the economic crystal ball hold for the next decade—the seventies. Our guess is a spectacular prosperity similar to the

sixties but for different reasons. The boom of the sixties was fueled by capital spending. The boom of the seventies will stem largely from the consumer. The two major forces will be governmental activities and the population changes.

Government spending on the federal and local levels will expand considerably—especially in the areas of defense and social welfare. Despite a slowdown in the relative growth of the total population in the next ten years, the young people coming into the labor market will accelerate tremendously.

These young adults have never known anything but prosperity. They will spend and borrow freely. These factors augur for a tremendous consumer boom in the seventies.

CRIME RATES AND ARREST RATES

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, during the recent campaign we heard a great deal about law and order. For some time now, I have carefully studied crime rates in my congressional district. Rates of arrest shed further light on the problems of crime and law enforcement.

On December 3, 1968, I dealt with this subject at a meeting in my district sponsored by the Gerritsen Beach Property Owners Association. The text of my remarks at that meeting follows:

CRIME RATES AND ARREST RATES

I am delighted to spend some time with you this evening. It has been my pleasure to meet many of you in the course of my campaign activities and at other community meetings. It is interesting how you run into the same faces at different civic meetings. It proves that those who take seriously their responsibilities as citizens find the time to engage in a variety of civic improvement projects.

As citizens of this community, you have every reason to be concerned about crime and narcotics.

During the first nine months of this year, the people of this Congressional District were the victims of 17,118 major crimes used by the F.B.I. Crime Index. And these are major crimes: murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, assault, burglary, larceny of \$50 and over, and motor vehicle theft.

That total nine month figure of 17,118 such major crimes reported may not mean much, unless you break it down into small components. In September, a typical month, 1905 such major crimes were reported in our district. During this month, the people in this congressional district suffered 24 larcenies of \$50 and over every 24 hours; we were the victims of 19 burglaries and 16 automobile thefts every day. In its simplest form, 2 and one-half major crimes were committed here every hour.

Nor do these statistics tell the whole story of crime. In the first place, they deal with only seven crime categories. For example, the sale and use of narcotics is not included in those categories; nor is vandalism, arson, and a great many other crimes.

Moreover, these statistics deal only with "reported" crime. But a great many crimes are committed and not reported. If any of you have been the victims of a crime and reported the incident, you might well decide not to report such a second time.

In brief, this could well be your experience. Your car is stolen and you report it. The police catch the thief. You have to go to the police precinct to sign a complaint. You have to go to a grand jury meeting. You go to court, and the case is adjourned. You come to court a second time, and the case is adjourned a second time. In the meanwhile you lose time from your work, or you are forced to neglect your business. The case finally comes to trial, and much to your surprise, the defendant is permitted to plead guilty to petty larceny, winds up with a slap on the wrist, and he is back on the streets, ready to resume his criminal career. By the time you get finished, you are no longer sure whether you or the defendant is the criminal. Many crime victims choose not to go through this experience twice.

The commission of the crime is one side of the story. The other side is to catch a thief. Unfortunately, we do not have arrest figures for this district; nor do I know whether they may be meaningful.

A person who commits a crime in this District could be arrested for it elsewhere. And a person can be arrested in this district for a crime committed elsewhere.

But we do have statistics for the city as a whole. In September a total of slightly over 43,000 major crimes were reported in New York City. During the same month, there were only about 18,000 arrests in the city. Putting it another way, if you are mugged on your way home from this meeting, the chances are two to one that they will never catch the mugger.

The odds in favor of the criminal are, in fact, much better than that. The arrest figures include persons arrested for felonies, misdemeanors, and other violations. The crimes included in the FBI index are mainly felonies. In September, only 5,400 felony arrests were made, as against 43,000 major crimes reported. So the chances of a criminal being arrested for one of these major crimes are approximately eight to one in his favor. And his chances of being convicted and winding up in jail are very slim. As you can see, there is not much truth in the rumor that crime doesn't pay.

With the odds so much in favor of the criminal, it becomes hardly surprising to find narcotics pushers openly conducting their dirty business in the streets of our neighborhoods particularly near schools.

It is a tragic fact that the number of narcotics users is increasing among people in all social and economic levels. What is particularly tragic is the sharp increase in drug abuse among young people.

Before I became a Congressman, I served as chairman of the New York State Joint Legislative committee on penal institutions. In that capacity I had a unique opportunity to observe at first hand the extent of increased use of drugs and the tragic consequences of drug abuse. Our best estimates indicate that there are 200,000 drug addicts in our city.

Commissioner Laurence W. Pierce, the chairman of the States narcotic addiction control commission, estimates that between 23,000 and 25,000 college students are placing their lives and their futures in jeopardy through experimentation with drugs. And the use of drugs also leads to crime.

It is reliably estimated that New York City addicts steal goods valued from half a billion to a billion dollars every year to feed their drug habit. This accounts for about 50 percent of all thefts in our city.

A great deal needs to be done and can be done to reduce crime. Clearly we need a larger police force. Of a total police force of approximately 30,000 only 4,000 are available for duty in any one shift. That is a figure recently made public by Commissioner Howard Leary.

More policemen on the street will deter crime.

A greater proportion of arrests will deter crime.

Streamlined procedures in our courts will deter crime.

I suggest, too, that there must be greater discipline in our society. The papers this morning were filled with stories of bands of students rampaging through the streets. That was hardly surprising.

Over the week-end, members of the so-called governing board of Ocean Hill publicly announced that they would seize J.H.S. 271—an act which falls little short of the firing on Fort Sumter, that began the Civil War. I don't know how you can teach law and order, and respect for authority, to young people, when adults take the lead in law breaking. And it will be interesting to observe what penalties will be imposed on those who seized J.H.S. 271, and drove out a State appointed administrator for the school district.

In the face of those events, responsible parents and community leaders are confronted by an extremely difficult time to preserve law and order. Yet it is a task to which we must dedicate ourselves, if our social structure is to function properly and peacefully. I know that those of you here tonight, and people throughout this neighborhood will do all we can to protect the quality of life in our community.

TWO MARINES, GI SLAIN IN VIETNAM—HETTINGER, KLINE, AND TAYLOR ADDED TO STATE'S LOSSES

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Marine Cpl. Mark L. Kline, Marine Pfc. Michael P. Taylor, and Army Sgt. Robert L. Hettinger, three fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO MARINES, GI SLAIN IN VIETNAM—HETTINGER, KLINE, AND TAYLOR ADDED TO STATE'S LOSSES

Two marines and an Army sergeant from Maryland have been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

They were:

Marine Cpl. Mark L. Kline, 20, son of Mr. and Mrs. Maynard O. Kline, of 115 Arch street, Cumberland.

Marine Pfc. Michael P. Taylor, 19, son of Mrs. Cecelia Taylor, of 638 North Streeper street, Baltimore.

Army Sgt. Robert L. Hettinger, 20, son of Mrs. Mabel R. Hettinger, of Oliver Beach, Baltimore county.

Corporal Kline died February 13 from wounds received during an enemy mortar attack in Quang Tri province near the Laotian border.

Corporal Kline, who was a leader of a rifle team, had enlisted in the Marines in September, 1967, and was sent to Vietnam April 1, 1968.

He was awarded the Purple Heart for shrapnel wounds he received in August, 1968.

He was a graduate of Fort Hill High School in Cumberland, where he played varsity football, baseball and track. After graduation he

worked as an ambulance driver for the MacDonald Ambulance Service.

ENLISTED LAST JUNE

Besides his parents, Corporal Kline is survived by a sister, Mrs. Lester Crawford, of Eckhart, Md., and a grandfather, Joseph Kline, of Wiley Ford, W. Va.

Private Taylor was also killed by mortar fire during an attack on his defensive position near the formerly demilitarized zone in Quang Tri province. He died February 11.

A graduate of Hampstead Hill Junior High School, he worked as a gas station attendant before enlisting in the Marines in June, 1968. He was sent to Vietnam 55 days ago.

According to his brother, Edward, Private Taylor's letters home conveyed the general impression "that he was confident of what he was doing and not afraid."

Besides his mother and brother, he is survived by two sisters, Barbara Taylor and Judy Taylor, both of Baltimore.

Sergeant Hettinger died from wounds received in an encounter with the enemy February 9 eleven days before his 21st birthday.

He enlisted in the Army January 30, 1968. He received his basic training at Fort Bragg and his advanced infantry training at Fort Lewis and attended non-commissioned officer's school at Fort Benning. He was sent to Vietnam December 30, 1968.

Sergeant Hettinger was a graduate of Kenwood High School and attended Essex Community College before enlisting.

According to his mother, Sergeant Hettinger was a car enthusiast and spent "two whole years" building a dragster.

Besides his mother, he is survived by two brothers, Frederick Hettinger, of Oliver Beach, and Walter Hettinger, a senior at the Johns Hopkins University.

U.S.-RHODESIA FOREIGN POLICY DISAPPROVED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 20, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a private poll has been conducted among U.S. citizens relative to our highly unpopular foreign policy against the Government of Rhodesia.

I think most of our colleagues will find the poll report of interest and I insert the results at this point in the RECORD:

HIGH-LEVEL AMERICANS APPEAL TO DISAPPROVE U.S.-RHODESIA POLICY

By percentages ranging from 74.9 percent to 99.9 percent, a national panel of American men and women whose attainments have been recognized in the leading business and professional directories disapprove the current U.S. trade sanctions against Rhodesia, and want our country to disentangle itself from the Johnson administration's policy, wherein it joined African nations and Britain in UN condemnation of Rhodesia.

During the first six weeks of 1969, the Long National Opinion Poll mailed intricate two-page questionnaires to several thousands of prominent men and women in all 50 states, asking them to respond with firm "yes" or "no" answers to seven questions which summarized the current state of U.S. relations with Rhodesia. Respondents were asked to study a situation summary, and then state their candid opinions, including personal comments with reference to both situation and survey in their own handwriting.

With a response of over 20 percent tabu-

lated and analyzed, preliminarily, as of February 14. W. H. Long, president of the research company conducting the poll—W. H. Long Marketing, Inc., Greensboro, N.C.—stated that "opinions of these thinking Americans, all people of distinguished attainments residing in over 250 communities, are so overwhelmingly in favor of changing the government's present attitudes toward this country which has always been our friend, that remaining response to the poll will not alter the figures very much."

Some idea of the quality and demographic character of the poll may be seen in these figures: Over 85 percent of respondents college-trained (32.7 percent with graduate degrees, 31.9 percent with college degrees, 24.1 percent attended but did not graduate). Almost 50 principal occupations recorded (28.3 percent executives, 12.3 percent educators, 11.3 percent each self-employed and housewives). Over 70 percent of respondents in vital 31-60 age groups that formed the vast majority of voters in 1966 and 1968 Congressional elections. Over 85 percent church-affiliated and over 88 percent own their homes. Place-of-residence distribution: 36.6 percent towns (10-100,000 population); 28.4

percent cities (100,000-1 million); 13.5 percent small towns (3-10,000); 10.7 percent large cities (over 1 million); 5.8 percent farm-rural; 5 percent village (under 3,000).

Responses as of February 14 to the seven questions are:

1). *Should the United States support the demand by some black-ruled nations for war on Rhodesia to overthrow its Government and establish black majority rule there?* No, 99.8 percent; Yes, 0.2 percent.

2). *Should the United States aid the armed bands of blacks, now being trained in Zambia by Chinese sent from Peking to organize bombing and killing raids into Rhodesia?* No, 99.9 percent; Yes, 0.1 percent.

3). *Should the United States demand that the UN impose on all nations the same one-man one-vote conditions for voting in Rhodesia, without regard for literacy, that the UN has prescribed for Rhodesia?* No, 74.9 percent; Yes, 25.1 percent.

4). *Should the United States halt its trade with all countries that have not adopted a one-man one-vote standard for voting?* No, 92.4 percent; Yes, 7.6 percent.

5). *Should the United States back British Prime Minister Wilson's claim that Britain*

has a right to specify voting requirements in Rhodesia? No, 86.2 percent; Yes, 13.8 percent.

6). *Should the United States back UN sanctions short of war that are intended to force Rhodesia to adopt black majority rule?* No, 83.7 percent; Yes, 16.3 percent.

7). *Should the United States refuse involvement in the demands of black-ruled nations, the claims and counter-claims of Britain and Rhodesia, steer clear of the whole issue, and follow a policy of friendliness toward all who are friendly with us?* Yes, 81.7 percent; No, 18.3 percent.

The polling firm, which believes polls taken among decisionmakers and opinion leaders, by mail, in their own homes, whereby they write in their own answers on a firm Yes-No basis, are more indicative of actual personal beliefs than sidewalk or front-door polls, expressed itself as surprised with the great number of comments written on the survey forms by respondents. Less than two-tenths of one percent of respondents noted they thought the poll was biased in any manner.

It is expected that results of the poll will be of keen interest to the new administration, members of Congress and trade groups.